

BLACKFRIARS

A MONTHLY REVIEW
EDITED BY ENGLISH DOMINICANS



NOVEMBER
1937

ONE SHILLING

OXFORD
Blackfriars

LONDON
Rolls House

BLACKFRIARS

(With which is incorporated *The Catholic Review*)

Literary Communications should be addressed to THE EDITOR, BLACKFRIARS, OXFORD. Telephone 3607. The Editor cannot be responsible for the loss of MSS. submitted. No MSS. will be returned unless accompanied by a stamped addressed envelope.

Single copies of BLACKFRIARS may be obtained through any book-seller, price One Shilling, in America Twenty-five Cents. *Yearly subscription*, Twelve Shillings, in America Three Dollars, may be sent to The Rolls House Publishing Co., Ltd., Rolls House, 2 Breams Buildings, London, E.C.4.

Communications in regard to *Advertisements* should be addressed to The Rolls House Publishing Co., Ltd., 2 Breams Buildings, London, E.C.4. Telephone Holborn 5708, 5709, 0603. Telegrams 'Publimedi, London.'

Vol. XVIII

NOVEMBER, 1937

No. 212

	PAGE
"RIGHT" AND "LEFT"	Jacques Maritain 807
CONRAD NOEL'S LIFE OF CHRIST	Richard Kehoe, O.P. 813
JOHN WESLEY AND CHRISTIAN PEACE	Vincent McNabb, O.P. 820
FAITH AND ORDER	Henry St. John, O.P. 828
CHRISTIAN SPAIN	Edward Quinn 835
RUSSIAN SOPHIOLOGY (II)	J. Danzas, T.O.S.D. 842
ADVANCE IN RETROSPECT	Aelwin Tindal-Atkinson, O.P. 849
ART AND PRUDENCE	Mark Brocklehurst, O.P. 853
A FIFTY YEARS' PLAN	R. P. Walsh 857
Extracts and Comments	"Penguin" 860
Correspondence: Eric Gill on <i>Work and Property</i>	866
Reviews: Social and Political Studies (C. Heron, O.P., V. White, O.P.); Liturgy (G. Meath, O.P.); History and Biography (W. Gumbley, O.P., H. J. Carpenter, O.P., V. McNabb, O.P.)	869
Notices	877

AQUINAS SOCIETY

PROGRAMME OF LECTURES, 1937-1938

Tuesday, 7th December.

“Poverty and Perfection in Ockham,”

by J. G. Sikes, Esq., Assistant Lecturer in History at Cambridge University.

Tuesday, 4th January.

“On the Inspiration of Scripture,”

by Rev. Fr. Richard Kehoe, O.P., S.T.L., S.S.L.

Tuesday, 8th February.

“Le Secret de la Sagesse en Israel,”

by Dom Hilaire Duesberg, O.S.B. (of the Institut Catholique de Paris, and the Ecole des Hautes Etudes de Gand).

Tuesday, 8th March.

“The Analysis of Free Will,”

by the Rev. D. J. B. Hawkins, D.D., Ph.D.

Tuesday, 5th April.

“St. Thomas and the Platonic Ideas,”

by the Rev. Fr. Victor White, O.P., S.T.L.

Tuesday, 10th May.

“Nicolaus of Cusa,”

by Dr. Raymond Klibansky, M.A., Lecturer in Philosophy, Oriel College, Oxford.

Wednesday, 8th June.

“Petrus Johannis Olivi, a younger contemporary of Aquinas,”

by Miss Decima Douie, M.A., Oxon., Ph.D. Manc., Lecturer in History at Durham University.

The Meetings are usually held at Burlington House, Piccadilly, at 8 p.m. The above programme is **subject to possible alteration**, but notices of each meeting are sent to all members of the Society. The Annual Subscription is 5/-. Further information may be had from the Hon. Secretary, 7 Pitt Street, W.8.

The Catholic Times

The oldest of the Catholic popular newspapers, gives the meaning of the news as well as the news. People trust their daily newspapers less and less, for they know that all kinds of propaganda are cloaked as news items. Therefore they look for a sure key to the news in this weekly guide to the truth.

The Catholic Times

tears away the mask from the propagandist. News is given its real value, put in proper and true perspective, and commented on whenever it touches vital Catholic interests.

The Catholic Times

has never been afraid to give a lead. It has never regretted the lead which it has given. That, surely, is a record which inspires pride, and which explains why those who want to be "in the know" are regular readers of this paper.

EVERY
FRIDAY 2d.

33 CHANCERY LANE
LONDON - W.C.2

UNIVERSITY OF LONDON

(UNIVERSITY EXTENSION LECTURES)

COURSES of LECTURES at the WESTMINSTER CENTRE,
St. Peter's Hall, Westminster Cathedral Precincts, S.W.1

MONDAYS

A COURSE OF TWENTY-FOUR LECTURES

on

THE FIRST EPISTLE OF ST. PETER

by

The Very Rev. Father VINCENT McNABB, O.P., S.T.M.

Commencing Monday, October 18th, 1937, at 7 p.m.

(Fourth Year's Work for the Diploma in the Literary, Historical and Comparative Study of the Bible. Other Students can attend)

THURSDAYS

A COURSE OF TWENTY-FIVE LECTURES

on

THE "SUMMA THEOLOGICA" OF ST. THOMAS AQUINAS

(Ia. QQ. i-xxvi.) The Existence and Nature of God

by

The Rev. Father THOMAS GILBY, O.P., S.T.L., Ph.D.

Commencing Thursday, October 14th, 1937, at 6 p.m.

ADMISSION FREE

Details of the Courses on application to the Hon. Local Secretary:

Miss D. FINLAYSON, 24 Primrose Hill Road, N.W.3

(NOTE BY CENTRE.—No charge is made for admission to the Courses, but it is necessary to take a COLLECTION at each Lecture in order to meet expenses, including the fee payable to the University. It is expected that all students who are able to do so will contribute to the collection, which takes the place of the fee charged at other Centres.)

Have you studied **THE CATHOLIC HERALD**

THE CATHOLIC HERALD is NOT an ecclesiastical paper but an ordinary weekly newspaper treating with a Catholic mind of the secular affairs of the world, social, economic, financial, political, cultural and even recreational.

THE CATHOLIC HERALD is the only paper of its type in this country.

THE CATHOLIC HERALD, with its sixteen full newspaper-size pages including a full page of news-pictures, is in form and content the nearest thing to a DAILY paper, owned and written by Catholics for Catholics, in this country.

THE CATHOLIC HERALD can alone give that full week by week Catholic acquaintance with the world as it is, which is essential for all who are working to apply the Pope's Social Lead.

A parish priest, writing to us on September 2nd of this year says:

"Allow me to pay a tribute to your very fine paper, the Catholic Herald. **I began to read it over a year ago** because of Mr. G. K. Chesterton's statement that it was the best of the Catholic papers. There is nothing exaggerated in that contention and I candidly agree with it. Now I look forward to it every week with the greatest pleasure because I know that you are going to tell me the inner meanings of the happenings on the Continent of Europe. There is no other paper, secular or religious, doing that . . . Your articles are not dry as dust, but deal with living people and their projects. They are stimulating because they present the case for the Faith, as the best minds in Europe see it."

EVERY FRIDAY
PRICE 2d.

“I look forward to THE TABLET

every week and commend it to the
attention of every intelligent student
of modern affairs”

H. V. MORTON

Recent contributors include:

CHRISTOPHER DAWSON, CHRISTOPHER HOLLIS,
P. C. LOFTUS, M.P., T. S. GREGORY, EDWARD
QUINN, DONALD ATTWATER, RONALD KNOX,
W. R. THOMPSON, F.R.S., etc.

6^{d.}
WEEKLY

Send a post card for
free specimen copy to
The Tablet, 39 Paternoster
Row, London, E.C.4

THE ARCHBISHOP
OF LIVERPOOL Says—

*“Catholics may well
be glad that they are
properly represented
among the high-class
weekly reviews.”*

The Master-General of the Dominicans says that he has a strong desire for every member of the Third Order throughout the world to have a copy in his own language of the book entitled "NOTRE VIE DOMINICAINE" by

Fr. FERDINAND JORET, O.P.

DOMINICAN LIFE

With a Foreword by

The Very Rev. Fr. BERNARD DELANY, O.P., B.Litt.
(English Provincial)

is the Official Translation for English-speaking peoples

THE work is a spiritual guide of the highest class, virile and persuasive, marking out the ground-plan of a sanely-ordered life in Christ, upon the strong foundation of the Dominican Rule. It is comprehensive and well-planned. The style is clear and moving, and unconsciously demonstrates why the spirituality of the Preachers has at all times extended its attraction not only to Tertiaries inside and outside the Cloister but to vast numbers outside the Order.

DEMY 8vo. 312 pp. 7s. 6d. net.

PUBLISHED BY

SANDS & CO. (Publishers) LTD.
15 King Street, Covent Garden, W.C.2

BLACKFRIARS

Vol. XVIII

NOVEMBER, 1937

No. 212

“RIGHT” AND “LEFT”

WE Christians of 1937 are the spectators of a terrible drama, a drama which confronts our consciences with agonizing problems. This drama is the disastrous struggle for power between two rival complex ideologies which have come to be known as “Right” and “Left.” Already this conflict is sapping the life-blood of Spain; already it is breeding rancour and hatred of brother for brother throughout the civilized world, and threatens the very foundations of civilization with irreparable disaster.

Elsewhere (in my *Lettre sur l'Indépendance*) I have sketched some of the characteristic traits which seem to me, as a student of philosophy and of current political trends, to be the distinguishing features of “Right” and “Left.”

To those observations one might add that in concrete experience, which is for the most part in actual fact an experience of misrepresentation (for misrepresentation pertains to man and leaves him only at the price of supreme intellectual discipline—*omnis homo mendax*), in concrete experience, I say, a particular and typical misrepresentation, closely bound up with the complex question which we are considering, makes its appearance.

For the “Right,” although it holds aloft the emblems of *Order*, by that very fact betrays *Principles*; it in fact betrays both *Order* and *Principles* by reason of its tendency towards what I have called “accumulative inertia.” In practice it does the very reverse of what it claims to do, for this inertia of its nature tends to produce a static condition of existence void of any internal justification.

In the same way, the “Left” betrays the very *aims* and *promises* for the future which it proclaims. While claiming to be the champion of *Movement*, it betrays itself in practice by reason of its tendency towards what I have called

“dissociation dépensive,” doing the very reverse of what it claims to do and tending to make existence impossible. It is true that, when times are relatively easy and favourable, there is certain eclectic spirit of compromise which inclines to weigh one false tendency against the other; but in sterner days it is another moderating force that is called for, and that force is the force of Truth.

* * * *

It must not be thought that I do not appreciate the feelings and the motives that animate much partisanship both of Right and of Left.

I understand that it is very hard to be patient when one sees an age-old legacy, hallowed by the long toil of generation after generation, threatened with destruction by the demagogic bigotry and smugness of impassioned agitators. Only recently, Stalin himself was saying: “It took dozens of thousands of men to build the great dam of Dnieprostroi; a dozen or two would be enough to destroy it.” Though perhaps Stalin did not realize it, this obvious truth is itself the condemnation of the spirit of violence in achieving revolution, of that very revolutionary violence which, since the advent of the “bourgeois Republic,” the Comintern has done its utmost to inflame in Spain.

On the other hand, it is no less hard to be patient when one sees thwarted a people’s aspirations for a form of social and political life more conformable to its dignity as human beings—its yearnings for deliverance from social misery, its aspirations for the elementary liberties that make human life on earth less intolerable. Especially is this so when this opposition to a people’s rights is the result of the prejudices of a complacent and self-satisfied privileged class which is totally blind to the very elements of social justice, and which—to make things worse—invokes religion itself to sanction its defence of its material advantages. They do indeed carry a terrible responsibility who, in the words of the Pope, “abuse the rights of property to defraud the labourer of his just hire and of the social rights which belong to it.”

* * * *

Nevertheless, to array hate against hate is to head for

catastrophe and the utter destruction of all political life.

Neither impatience nor violence—no matter under what provocation—can ever work the good of society or of nation.

A popular tyranny can never effectually defend popular liberties; nor can a surly refusal to recognize the facts of life, movement and progress, ever be an effective means of defending public Order. The only policy which will benefit a nation or a society so deeply divided as those around us, is a policy which is at once patient and dynamic, which will enable the social organism at once to eject the toxins and to assimilate all that is good in the new elements and forces. It must pass on, indeed, to new phases of life and existence, and for that it must *transfigure* the legacy of the past. If men would only read the Gospels they would find therein unsuspected treasures of wisdom for the guidance of even mundane policy.

"To whom much has been given, much shall be required." That is a hard saying which is nevertheless a universal law. It means, among other things, that those who claim to be the champions of Order and of the Spirit must serve Order and the Spirit even in the means they employ to defend them. A Christian has less option than has an atheist in the choice of means to advance his cause. When, in face of threatening revolt, responsible elements of society use words that harmonize with sound philosophy and religion and deeds that make a mockery of them; when, in effect, they behave with the same animal instincts as the mobs which they fear—then they do the revolution's own work and aggravate its force and malice. Inevitably so; an inexorable law is here in play.

So too, those who hold the reins of government have more weighty responsibilities than those who do not. It is of the very essence of the temporal social organism that it be a complexus of *disciplined liberties*, and this can be created only by civic virtue and civic fellowship (*amitié*). Where these are lacking, force and fear must take their place and overawe all.

* * * * *

But, if force there is to be, to whom does it belong to

wield it? Inevitably at such times the *de facto* public authority tends to become, from this point of view at least, the only source from which peace and order in the community may be expected. It tends to concentrate power and the means of wielding force more and more into its own hands, a lamentable state of affairs but one which is necessary under the circumstances for civil peace. Hence, any attack on that authority, even though it be thought a tyrannical one, runs a particularly serious risk of provoking still greater evils. This risk will be all the greater if, as in the case of most modern governments, that authority has, or claims to have, its roots in the will of the masses. On the other hand, this situation lays the very heaviest responsibilities on the public authority itself; more than ever will it be called upon under such abnormal conditions to exercise the highest degree of justice and courage in maintaining public order and in mastering the anarchy of factions. When (as in Spain since the fall of the monarchy) a country has entered upon a phase of revolutionary unrest, impartiality and courage on the part of the government is particularly essential. Especially will this be so if the government is, or claims to be, a 'Popular one which represents and incorporates the aspirations and hopes of the people. If such a Government shows weakness towards either enemies or friends, it will betray both the good of the nation and the confidence of the people, and will jeopardise its own work and aims. Strong and just measures, coming from the hands of the public authority, may cause passing pain; but better this than disorder and disruption. *Incompetent revolutions beget Dictatorships.*

■ * ■ * ■

Already we have seen too many incompetent revolutions and the ruinous reactions they bring in their train.

Already the very word *Revolution* is losing its glamour and is wearing thin. Perhaps another word will come to take its place of honour in the political vocabulary of poor humans; a word that has fallen into ill-repute because it has been dishonoured by many who bear it. I mean the word *Conservative*, taken in its true philosophical sense.

“RIGHT” AND “LEFT”

Perhaps there will arise in the world some true *Conservatives*.

Taken in its truest sense, to *conserve* means to *keep* all that is good in what has been acquired and achieved by human industry throughout the ages. To keep it, but to keep it *alive*; “conserve” it as God “conserves” His creation in being. In this sense, the word “conservative” is a noble word, and to be a “conservative” is a noble thing.

A true conservative, then, is a man who is reverent towards the past, and yet is keenly aware of changing times and of the needs of the future. The true conservative is the greatest of innovators. He is prepared for the most radical of revolutions, for his task is to preserve the heritage of the past, a heritage which is not dead but alive. He will not try to juggle with history, piously invoking the past as a pretext for ignoring the present; he will not betray realities by a policy of sham, opportunism and alliances with elements and interests with which he should have nothing to do. He will not boast of being the champion of principles which he betrays in practice, nor will he sacrifice essential ideals to immediate success.

There are already too many men whose good-will and intentions and lofty ideals are unquestionable, but whose discreet machiavellianism in the methods they employ threatens civilization with ruin.

The true conservative will not be unaware of the rôle which the powers of darkness play in human history and progress, nor of that diabolic tendency to inertia which prevents good seed from bearing fruit. But he will know also that a good God is the sovereign Master of history, and that He will at the end put to nought the evil designs of the wicked.

The true conservative, then, will not hesitate to co-operate openly and fearlessly with everything that promises, under divine Providence, real growth in the historic processes and changes of his time. In this he will not compromise with the illusions of any dialectical philosophy of history, but he will know that herein, humanly speaking, lies the only chance of directing aright the course of history. To this end

he will focus all his energies to the attainment of true wisdom, unwavering justice, genuine impartiality, deep understanding of the exigencies of law and of the *bonum commune*. So equipped, he will be able to withstand all the enticements of demagogery and dissolution on the one hand, and of error and hypocrisy on the other. He will decline neither to the Left hand, nor to the Right.

But all this will presuppose, as an indispensable condition, a firm grasp not only of sound metaphysics, but also a sound social philosophy and a sound philosophy of history.

Above all it will presuppose a realism, a sense of realities, which will be something very different from the superficial cynicism of a *Realpolitik*. It will be a realism firmly rooted in, and impregnated by, the spirit of Faith in God.

JACQUES MARITAIN.

CONRAD NOEL'S LIFE OF CHRIST

THE noble quality of the sentiments of this book¹ will account for its having received on the whole a far more indulgent treatment by the reviewers—even by those writing on behalf of the Churches—than it properly deserves. There might be a strong temptation to follow this general lead, if it were any less easy than it is, while attacking the book, to maintain entire respect for the author. The doctrine is completely untrue to the principles of the Anglo-Catholic Creed which the author professes. It is in fact but a travesty of Christian doctrine. But this clearly is a mischance that has come about through an undisciplined cavalry charge by the Left wing of the author's mind. A reviewer can take his stand comfortably between the author and his book.

Christ as portrayed in these pages shows Himself to be first and foremost a socio-political revolutionary. An order of social well-being, of justice and plenty achieved for all men, does not appear to Him as an effect that should naturally follow upon and be as the fulfilment and expression of the spiritual life He brings to men, but rather as an essential constitutive means for the formation of a state of "salvation." That is to say, it is only by a successfully achieved reordering of social conditions that the salvation He offers can become a "saving" thing at all. If He is to be called our Saviour (in any sense that He Himself would approve) it can only be through a salvation which in fact delivers our bodies in this world from the evils of injustice and poverty and the rest.

It is not a heavenly happiness that he envisages immediately for us—not any such happiness as might be based on a supernatural union with God and the hope of the consummation of that union. The happiness he intends for us is in another category from that. It has a different axis. Thus there is no reference to be found to the kingdom of the

¹ The Life of Jesus, by Conrad Noel. London. J. M. Dent & Sons Ltd. (12/6.)

next world in Christ's "parables of the kingdom"—one exception being made, however, for the parable of Dives and Lazarus, which provides "about the only" instance of "allusion" by Him to the next life. The kingdom referred to in the parables is the commonwealth of the New World Order, the happy society of the Good Time Coming, of that Golden Age of this world which we to-day still look for. It is into this kingdom that His disciples were exhorted to qualify themselves to enter, and it is the threat of exclusion from this kingdom that forms the constant sanction He pronounces against all Fascist-sinners. To set your treasure in heaven comes to mean, to look ahead and contrive that when the commonwealth of the Good Time Coming be realized and all Capitalist and Fascist tyrants eliminated, you may not find yourself forced as a reactionary into the hall of exile. It becomes clear then what, for example, will be the sound interpretation of a parable like that of The Unjust Steward. The meaning, the moral, will be this: "That you should make to yourselves friends by means of the mammon of injustice, that when ye fail (or it fails) they (the workers to whom you have been generous) may accept you in the coming kingdom as one of themselves." And again, with the parable of the great assizes at which the wicked are condemned to hell and the just invited to enter the kingdom, it will readily be understood that this represents a judgment that takes place not in heaven but "at every crisis of world history," by virtue of which those nations (for it will be question of a corporate judgment) found to have performed the social duties of feeding the hungry, freeing the oppressed, etc., will enter more or less into the state of salvation that is the Good Time of the Golden Age. So of Russia at the present time, so of the France of the days of the destruction of the ancient régime.

The author's conclusion that it was no other-worldly heaven that Christ preached and set Himself to found for us, becomes irresistible if one accepts his intimation of the truth of the hypothesis of a final universal salvation. If the hell of the next life is finally to be abolished, and the heavenly

heaven to be laid open to all, clearly the only hell man need seriously fear is the hell on earth that is brought about by those who kill our bodies, and the only heaven he need be concerned about securing is the heaven that shall consist in the noble Good Time to be set up here below. But all the emphasis is placed on the higher viewpoint that recognizes this present world of our's as being divinely charged from its creation with the potential capacities to become a first-rate heaven of its own for the enjoyment of the children of men. The only legitimate New Heaven and New Earth for our present aspirations is this good world of our's as redeemable from its present artificial collapse by a revolutionary movement that shall transform it into a land flowing with milk and honey for the workers, make of it a Christian-Communist paradise. "Christian," for it is from Christ that the cause will have received its original impulse, and—in some way that it would be esoteric and somewhat pietistic to dwell on—His spirit moreover will have been at work actively furthering the final triumphant movement *from above*.

Christ failed to achieve this end in His own life-time only because His hands were tied: the time was not ripe for the use of the necessary violence. If He had resorted to violent action, His followers would have abused their triumph, and some new form of tyranny would have replaced the old. Deprived of the support of the necessary legions He inevitably failed. But He had shown the way, He had revived the hopes of men in the practicability of the earthly heaven, He had formulated as no one had ever done before the divine sanctions that underlie such a hope and can spur us on to strive for its realization.

Supposing the above to be, what it is meant to be, a roughly accurate rendering of the central meaning of the book, it might seem that formal criticism were scarcely needed. The system presents itself clearly enough as an amalgam of Fertility Culture with a de-spiritualized Old Testament Messianic moralism. Nevertheless it may be of some use to try to discover through what doctrinal inadvertences it was made possible for a Christian mind to become

involved in this welter. But there is need first of one justificatory explanation. It has to be admitted that it was not the purpose of the author to expound the full doctrinal significance of the life of Christ as apprehended by Christian faith and theology. "I have tried," he says, "to see his life and teaching from the angle of those who actually came across him for the first time and were drawn within the orbit of his influence. Theological deductions as to his nature and his relations to the Godhead are of a later date." That being so nevertheless the fact remains that what would pass very well as an account of such misconceived impressions of the teaching of Christ as might well have formed in the mind of some casual listener in the crowd, or even possibly of some disciple at an early stage of formation, comes to be vigorously recommended here as though it were an authentic rudimentary introduction to the mind of Christ.

The cornerstone of the system seems to be a rather barbarous misapprehension of Christian Grace as being a force whose feminine rôle it is essentially to foster the latent powers of nature; to redeem that brute, and to become a radiant partner in its restored life and happiness. Which is nothing but a well-known old-fashioned Protestant heresy revived—the missing of the truth that it is for nature to be caught up into the life-of-grace, to take on a new and other life from above, from beyond itself. From this demeaning of Grace to Nature—from this misrepresenting of Grace as denoting characteristically a process of redemption back to a "primal" freedom that belongs to us according to the terms of creation, or a process of recapturing the values that are latent in our world; from this to a demeaning of Christianity to Communism, which is the unconscious achievement of this book, the way was perfectly straight and smooth.

How completely the author brings Grace to heel may be judged from the treatment it receives in the only passage in which it is dealt with explicitly:

"This word 'grace' runs like a golden thread through all their writings, occurring some two hundred times in the New Testament alone. It signifies beauty, charm, naturalness, and reminds us

CONRAD NOEL'S LIFE OF CHRIST

of that ease and gracefulness of the trained athlete . . . In reading of these first communities of Jesus, we are reminded of Bernard Shaw's picture of Siegfried as a type of the healthy man rejoicing in his impulses . . . Many prophets have mourned to the people, . . . but there seemed to have arisen One who had lured men with his shepherd's pipes and they had begun to dance . . . Among modern poets Walt Whitman has recaptured this Christian rapture, and sings 'I give nothing as duties . . . '

The passage does not stop there. From G. B. Shaw, Havelock Ellis and Walt Whitman it then takes you back to the early Christian martyrs who also were possessed by this spirit of "triumphant gaiety." They too could shout for joy; for they too had their eyes set on a world that was brimming over with the grandest possibilities of a Good Time Coming. For make no mistake, the particular heaven on which *they* were intent was the heaven that seemed to them to promise to break out at any moment upon this good earth of ours, to which the lions belonged who were about to devour them. They were no pietists.

Granted the success of the Promethean enterprise of severing Grace from its heavenly relationships, it becomes possible immediately to have a heaven of our own that shall be a perfect little detached and self-contained replica of the heaven above. Grace will set to work to fill up the measure of this world's capacity for well-being, and will no longer go streaming away into the sea of everlasting life. Then the centre of Christian happiness will no longer lie in a movement, a gravitation towards the vision of God. Separate upstairs and downstairs heavens will have been contrived, and between them such a gulf fixed that it will at once be seen to be enervating and anti-patriotic behaviour for the downstairs inhabitants even to allow their minds to dwell on the heaven that is above.

The prophet Osee, proclaiming that it was not sacrifice but mercy that was wanted, could be trusted to keep his theological balance and not to forget that what his exaggerated oratorical language really meant was that sacrifice without mercy was in vain. But one seems to be able to detect our present author being subverted by his own oratorical methods. "Away with your hankerings after

the heavenly Jerusalem, and let us have a little justice and mercy practised in the world where we are living" or some such expression might fit in very well as a movement in a Christian harangue, but it is disastrous that it should be allowed to congeal into a theological maxim. That is the treachery the author seems to allow his own rhetoric to practise against him. He reacts against a false other-worldliness only to establish another in its place. And this corrupt form of Christianity which gives him his chief theme for counter-exposition, is it nearly so common as he supposes, or is he not perhaps too readily assuming its prevalence out of sympathy with Communist slogans? It might reasonably be maintained that the number of those who are given to covering over their social misdemeanours with excuses drawn from false other-worldly religious principles are negligibly small. At any rate what is certain is that the Christian way of exhorting false Christians to behave like true Christians is not to preach abstinence from supernaturalism, not to drag them away from their prayers but to exhort them to pray better, and to think more intently than they *have* done about the mysteries of the hidden life of Grace. But for that it is necessary to recognise that Christian other-worldliness does not mean a playing truant from this world, because this world and the next world have been married for us. It is necessary to see that Christian other-worldlymindedness means a supernatural sharing in the mind of God, Who knows and loves only Himself, but in so doing can know and love His creatures in and unto Himself.

And the author appears to have missed the meaning of Christian love no less fundamentally—which at least was consistent in him. Consider the following passage:

"In fact any nation that has done such thing" (performed the corporal works of mercy, that is) "has accepted the Christ, and any nation neglecting such social duties has rejected him. It is remarkable that this is precisely the opposite to the teaching of certain evangelists of our day, who seem to assert that your first and sole duty is consciously to surrender to Jesus, and that, as a consequence of that surrender, you may individually come to love the poor and do good to them. But this 'secondary' love of your neighbour will then be a 'command performance,' and not flow

instinctively from your relation with him. All this is bad psychology."

If this means what it seems to mean, and what the whole tenour of the book suggests that it does, then it would take the very heart out of the Christian religion. It is the hope of an instructed Christian that by means of God's grace he may be drawn into a love-communion with God, such as shall give him possession of God as that which he loves, and at the same time necessarily as the principle by which he shall love. He will love God and he will love like and with God. If this is an impossibility, the Christian meaning of Charity is only a fiction. But it is strange that it should seem so pyschologically obvious to the author that to love one's neighbour in God is not to love him genuinely, but only to make him an excuse or an occasion for performing a ritual of a sham love affair with God. For what does seem an obvious law of psychology is that when one man loves another he is being drawn by and reaches out to something greater than—although not apart from, but for the moment represented in—the friend or neighbour who is the immediate object of his love. No man can love anything except as enfolding it within whatever may be his supreme love. The men of the Soviet Republic whose social virtues excite the admiration of our author can be supposed to treat one another kindly only because they are in love with justice and goodness. Make them to be still more in love with justice and goodness and their benevolence will but have grown greater. But suppose it were possible that they should fall in love with a Being Who is Justice and Who is Goodness? Or with one Who is Love?

It would be tiresome to comment on the unreadiness the author has shown to "obtrude" upon us even a hint of the Gospel teachings concerning the divinity of Christ, or the Mystical Body, or concerning sacramental grace, and so on. Quite enough has already been said to present what may be the false impression that the Christianity which appears in this book is a thing in rags, and starved and tortured, as though conformed to the image of that physical wretchedness among us that has moved the author to his noble anger and pity.

RICHARD KEHOE, O.P.

JOHN WESLEY AND CHRISTIAN PEACE

SOME little time ago the present writer was ordered by his Prior to speak at an Inter-denominational Anti-War demonstration on Hampstead Heath. The demonstration was no doubt due to a widespread opinion that, all physical and political expedients for ensuring peace having failed, the only hope for peace would be through moral means. This opinion bore on its face the outline of sanity and almost of inevitability. Indeed so sane and inevitable did it seem, and does it still seem, that even men who profess to believe that religion is the opium of the people are often found blaming the ministers of religion for not bringing in, as by a miracle, the reign of peace.

The difficulty I felt in being obedient to the command of obedience was not a distaste for any command. Still less was it a disagreement with the belief that no physical nor political expedients but only moral expedients will end war. But I felt a great disinclination to speak on an inter-denominational peace platform; and that, firstly, because of an inevitable conclusion and, secondly, because of an undeniable observation.

The inevitable conclusion was that if war could be ended only by moral means the chief agents in ending it could only be the moral expert or professionals, namely the ministers of religion.

The undeniable observation was that nowhere was there such a state of war and such a need of peace as in the sphere of religion.

This conclusion and this observation made it impossible for me to mount a peace platform except with a deep sense of hypocrisy or of humility. To ask the politicians and the statesmen to listen to a religious plea for peace whilst I and my fellow ministers of religion were in a state of religious war seemed almost shameless hypocrisy. Unless I and my fellows deserved the reproach "Physicians heal yourselves" I could only say to the war-wearied people: "Do as we say,

and not as we do." But, in saying that, the only plea for an inter-denominational peace platform with a moral appeal was blown to fragments.

* * * *

It is not international peace, it is religious peace that is now the chief need of the world.

Yet so many official and self-commissioned ambassadors of religious peace have died with shattered hopes or reputations that a way to peace seemed to rest only within the possibilities of omnipotence. Nowhere in the sphere of churchmen's actions or effective desires but only in the sphere of God's effective grace was there found any reasonable argument against despair. With both sides committed to a "Non possumus" attitude which forbade almost the preliminaries of discussion or even of explanation, religious peace seemed dead and buried without hope of Easter resurrection.

But the book which has stimulated this lengthy review is one to stimulate its readers into hope. Not the least hope-begetting page is its first page which makes despair almost a sacrilege. Let it be set down: "JOHN WESLEY IN THE EVOLUTION OF PROTESTANTISM by Maximin Piette, Doctor and Master in Sacred Theology of Louvain, M.A. of Harvard University, Laureate of the French Academy, Professor of History at Brussels. *Translated* by J. B. Howard, *with a Foreword* by Bishop F. C. Kelley and Dr. H. B. Workman.—London, Sheed & Ward. 1937."

When we add that the original French edition bears the *imprimatur* of Mgr. Ladeuze, Rector of the University of Louvain, the significance of the book is seen to be more than that of a historian's study on a great historical character.

It may well be questioned whether any book published in any language has been beflagged by so many significant names representing so many different peoples. The writer of the book and the Rector of the University who gives the book its *imprimatur* belong to Belgium. Their names on the title page of the book recall the debt of gratitude the Catholics of England owe to the little land that gave them shelter in their religious exile; and the equal debt of

gratitude the people of England owe to the little people who were war-martyred for four years rather than tear up their bond of obligation.

The prize given by the French Academy recalls the land that gave us Bossuet's heroic if unsuccessful efforts towards religious peace, and St. Francis of Sales' inalterable mildness with Calvin and the Calvinists. Bishop Kelley and the translator speak for the New World where are foregathered more shades of religious thought than justified Pope Leo the Great's judgment on Rome; *magnam sibi videbatur assumpsisse religionem quia nullam respuebat falsitatem*. Lastly, the Wesleyan who sponsors the book and authenticates its portrait of Wesley is Wesley's fellow countryman.

The words of the Bishop about this book by a Franciscan Friar are of striking appositeness: "This is the kind of history we hope to have before the century is out. Rulers may still want flattery, statesmen apology and soldiers praise—for leaders want history shaped and trimmed to their own order and design—but the truth wants something else; something which does not exclude eulogies but does demand that they be tested by the facts. Therefore we do not find it strange nowadays to find a Jew eulogising the life and mastering the works of St. Thomas Aquinas, and a Franciscan friar writing the life of John Wesley."

These emphatic words written at the end of four centuries of religious wrangling mark a change of the tide.

The change of controversial tide is still furthered marked by what the Rev. Dr. H. B. Workman writes as a Foreword from the authenticating Wesleyanism of Westminster College: "Father Piette is not only a scholar with a very deep knowledge of the period and of the character about whom he is writing, but, even more important, he possess great sympathies with the spiritual movements which he discerns beneath the surface. There is no work on Wesley which I have ever read which seems to me to combine in so eminent a degree insight and scholarship together with a certain critical faculty, this last most advisable especially for those readers who are members of the Methodist Church."

These emphatic words uttered from the depths of a Wesleyan Sanctuary mark not only a change of the tide, but a lowering of the flood.

* * * *

If we make bold to plunder some of the good things of Dr. Piette's book, it is only to send our readers to the book which has provided our booty. Unless they have eyes that see not, they will marvel at what a son of St. Francis of Assisi has to tell them about a leader of Protestantism. The Wesley family itself will be the first marvel. The head of it, the Rev. Samuel Wesley is an early convert from Non-conformity to the Anglican Church. His gifted and widely-read wife Suzannah (Annesley) owes her conversion from Socinianism to her book-loving, God-fearing husband. In spite of a poverty which sometimes has to stint the parents' bread, John Wesley, their famous son, is the thirteenth of nineteen children. The love of God and the love of the children whom God sent are so sovereign in the home that when angered parishioners burn down the Parsonage, the father cries out, "Come neighbours, let us kneel down. Let us give thanks to God; He has given me all my eight children; Let the house go, I am rich enough." It was worthy of the author of a massive (most unreadable) commentary on Job.

The study of the mother of John Wesley throws light on those gifts of mind and soul which have won for her the title of "the Mother of Methodism." Her home life may startle Catholics by its many resemblances in means and method to the Catholic homes of penal and sub-penal years. This book-loving woman who never had good health and often had slender fare was mated to a book-loving husband whom she "loved" honoured and obeyed" in spite of his leaving her all the domestic and educational work of her younger children. The secret of her miracle of success was in her conviction that "God had honoured her by giving her the care of so many souls for whom she was to give Him an account at the last day."

Her uncommon gift of intelligence showed itself not

unpsychologically, in her "ordering the day according to a fixed method." Yet it is amazing that this Mother of so large a family could "every day give two hours to meditation, one in the morning and one in the afternoon—and could find time for an examination of conscience and a quarter of an hour's recollection before family prayers"! To strengthen her soul for this almost cloister life, she found food first in the Bible and then mainly in the *Imitation of Christ*. In her admirable life of union with God through home-duties done willingly and well, she depended, perhaps, more than she knew, and more than we know, on that Catholic asceticism which was even then giving such masterpieces of life and literature to the world.

If we have dealt at length on this strong woman whose homecraft was of the highest, it is because there is a sense in which the spiritual movement which Wesley is taken to have begun in a college at Oxford, was really begun by the mother of Wesley in the home at Epworth. No wonder that the movement when it began its Oxford phase is faithfully described in these amazing words:

"He preached, as regards faith, the uninterrupted apostolical succession, which links up the Anglican Bishops with the first Bishops commissioned by the Apostles."

The idea of going back to the first days of "the Church for an hierarchical episcopacy led him, likewise, to reform his liturgical life to the most ancient usages."

Frequent Communion was one of the most "characteristic traits of the little company. In conformity with tradition they were careful to add a few drops of water to the wine used for the sacrament."

"(They refrained) from taking anything on Wednesdays and Fridays until after three."

Ministers who had not received their Ordination from the hands of a Bishop could not validly administer the Sacrament.

He approved of auricular confession and attempted to introduce it among his friends.

Wesley taught the spirit of prayer to his companions and introduced them to the practice of reciting the collect for the

day not only at Prime, but at Terce, Sext and None. (page 283.)

No wonder that, as the writer chronicles, "Wesley was accused all his life of being a Papist."

* * * *

In the amazing success of this Methodist Movement there were three elements: 1st, the call to personal holiness; 2nd, the apostolate of the spoken word; 3rd, lay preachers or catechists.

1st. There is no doubt that the chief factor in spreading the Wesleyan movement was that, within the law-established Church of England, it was the first movement to deal with the individual as such and with individual holiness as such. Few accredited historians are now found to hold that the Tudor settlement of religion, whether under Henry or under Elizabeth, was primarily religious. If it was not primarily economic or political, it was so definitely economic and political that any concern for the religious state of individual souls is undiscoverable. It was a legal settlement by ordinary catastrophic or revolutionary methods. The normal machinery of legislation was used, as in such revolutions it is wont to be used, to give the new thing the semblance of being old. The very title of the new Liturgy, "Book of Common Prayer," and of the new legislation, "An Act of Uniformity," proclaim the fact that it is not individual Englishmen and Englishwomen that are to be considered, but the Realm, i.e., the Sovereign or the Sovereign Power of England.

But the Oxford movement which Wesley began took the individual soul in its relation to God as the be-all and end-all of religion.

2nd. Wesley agreed with St. Dominic that in order to beget or foster religion "the beginning is the Word."

Whilst not comparing him with his Catholic contemporaries in his opportunities for preaching the Gospel, we cannot help comparing the result of his use of his greater opportunities. No doubt some of our Catholic priests were aware of the value of the spoken word, and even toiled in that furrow. But which of them equalled this Oxford Fellow in

his self-denying ordinance not to speak the language of the Schools, but the simple language of the people? Which of them in half-a-century of apostolic life had travelled, often on foot, 225,000 miles—and had preached some 40,000 sermons? Toil such as this would have raised up harvests from the barren rock. An Abraham such as Wesley could only raise up sons of Abraham.

3rd. It is not a little humiliating that at a time when Catholics in the foreign mission field were organizing valuable groups of catechists, or lay-preachers, they seemed unwilling or unable to organize them in the home missions where they were most needed. It was part of the genius of John Wesley that he had no hesitation in boldly copying the catechist or lay-preacher organization with a success which cost the English Church the working-class of England; and ended dramatically in what we of the old Church would call a schism from a schism.

When the existing authority of the Church to which Wesley had promised religious obedience would not grant his new methods of religious worship citizenship, the severance between the Mother Church and her child was complete. There was no formal excommunication of these seekers after personal holiness. Mother and child had simply grown apart.

The contrast between this earlier Oxford Movement and the century-later Oxford Movement has lessons which should not be ignored by anyone who, in days of dispirited believers, seeks to build up the walls of Jerusalem.

Methodism sprang up spontaneously from the womb of Anglicanism. It was begotten of a desire to do for the individual souls within the English Church what a Church is primarily intended to do. But the historic and legal Church of England, as Wesley found it, was not congenitally sympathetic with the individual. From the very first moment of the Methodist Movement it was inevitable that the end of the movement, though not the aim of the movers, would be outside the Church by law-established.

In striking contrast with this earlier movement which began from ascetical longings within the Church was the

JOHN WESLEY AND CHRISTIAN PEACE

later Movement which was occasioned by the attacks made by those outside the Church. When the nation, expressing itself ultimately through Parliament threatened to disendow, and therefore disown, the Nation expressing itself religiously through the established Church, the only valid defence was by falling from a national to a super-national basis by asserting that the English Church was no more and no less than the Catholic Church in England.

The results of this claim were astounding both to those who made it and to those who were angry that it was made. The Bishops of the Church of England did not at once see that the claim to make the English Church the Catholic Church of England was giving them an authority higher than the Sovereign or the Sovereign Power in England by making them the successors of the Apostles. The severance between Anglicanism and Methodism was not to be repeated a century later when the Oxford Group though at issue with the Bishops in the matter of discipline, even of doctrine, were making a stand for episcopacy such as had not been made since Elizabeth's first Parliament silenced the Hierarchy by statutory enactments. While such as Keble and Pusey and Newman were exalting the Bishops there was little fear that any formal or effective act would turn Tractarianism into a schism.

Under Wesley and the Methodists, as under Newman, the central question had been "Authority." Wesley thought that the Church of England had no authority to quench the spirit that stirred in individual souls; and was all his life long looked on as a papist.

Newman thought that the Church of England had an apostolic episcopal power higher than the Crown of England; and died a Cardinal of the Roman Church because he believed his Bishop who told him that his place was Rome.

The contrast between the two men and the two Movements has so many agreements that their development may be one of the surprises of the century to come.

VINCENT McNABB, O.P.

FAITH AND ORDER¹

WHATEVER opinion Catholics may hold about the utility of the World Conference on Faith and Order recently held at Edinburgh we must at least recognize the witness it bears to a deep and growing determination on the part of Christians of widely differing allegiances to bring to an end the disastrous divisions of Christendom. This determination has given rise to a new way of approach to the problem of re-union, a new technique in dealing with the differences which divide Christians.² Controversy of the old type between antagonists, who laboured without any attempt at mutual understanding or sympathy to prove themselves entirely right and their opponents entirely wrong, is of comparatively little use in attaining truth. Its place has been taken by the way of affirmation which first explores and emphasizes every possible point of agreement and by so doing clearly marks off the points at which divergence begins and how far it extends. Experience shows that such divergence is often due more to the partial or faulty presentation of truth than to perversity of mind or will in accepting it. The careful probing of historical causes can do much to prepare the way for reconciliation, by a frank acknowledgment of shortcomings where they exist and a sympathetic understanding of the false emphasis and consequent error to which such shortcomings have often given rise. This is the human and preparatory element in the work of the Reunion of Christendom; the necessary spade-work which must be done before the soil is ready for the Holy Spirit to produce the fruits of reconciliation—a perfect union of heart and mind in Christ Jesus.

¹ *The Reformation, the Mass and the Priesthood*, by E. C. Messenger, Ph.D. Vol. II. Rome and the Revolted Church. (Longmans; pp. xx + 772, 30s.)

² This new way of approach and technique is now commonly described as "ecumenicism," a new and tongue-twisting word derived from the ecumenical movement which issued in the Stockholm and Lausanne Conferences in 1925 and 1927 and in the Oxford and Edinburgh Conferences this year.

Can Catholics adopt this way of approach, even though a large and heterogeneous gathering such as that assembled at Edinburgh may seem to them a dangerous way of putting it into practice? We know that a distinction can be drawn between the Faith as formally defined and taught by the supreme authority of the Church and the spirit of the age as it affects the Faith in the lives of individual Catholics during a particular period or over a particular geographical area. We believe that the Faith itself cannot be distorted by false emphasis or partial presentation because it is guarded and interpreted by a teaching authority that cannot fail, but we have to acknowledge that the spirit of the age which surrounds the Faith can sometimes obscure it or cause its faulty or partial application in the thoughts and lives of contemporary Catholics. This faulty and partial application may extend even to the preaching and teaching of the Faith; there have been periods when the pastors of the Church were almost dumb and the hungry sheep looked up and were not fed; periods too when important aspects of the Church's teaching were allowed to fall into the background, or were not sufficiently insisted on.

The Reformation began as a protest against deep-seated evils and corruptions in the Church. It was a protest that went woefully wrong and proved itself a remedy worse than the disease; though it was exploited by the greed of the worldly for their own ends, it is hard to deny the sincerity and good intentions of many of the Reformers, and it is not for us to judge which incurs the greater guilt—the zeal of heresy or the apathy of a lifeless and formal orthodoxy. The Church of England which the Reformation produced as a self-sufficient entity, cut off from the rest of Christendom, has a Christian character and genius and a still powerful influence which extends beyond the bounds of its practising membership. In a society which is in grave danger of disintegration under the advancing tide of neo-paganism it is imperative that Christianity should speak with a united witness and an authority unimpaired by divided allegiance. We Catholics know what will be the Faith of a re-united Christendom, but we do not know what particular form that

re-united Christendom will take, what traditional elements now existing outside the Church are capable of being incorporated into its unity. But it is clearly our duty to work for the healing of the wounds of Christendom, not by advocating ready made schemes of corporate reunion; these are purely speculative and therefore dangerous, but by patiently working to make contacts of understanding with our separated brethren in order that we may prepare the ground for the fruit that God will bring forth.

In this work we must have two aims in view, and these are complementary; isolation from the other is likely to render either of them almost entirely fruitless. The first aim must be to explain and elucidate the Faith; the second, a wide and difficult one, demanding not only deep knowledge but abounding sympathy, to probe into the historical causes of the breach with Rome and thus to enter into the minds of our separated brethren, to see ourselves as it were from their point of view and to understand the origin and growth of their particular doctrinal tradition and ethos. Only by a synthesis of these two aims can the ground be prepared for that unity of Faith which the Holy Ghost alone can bring into being.

Judged by the first of these aims, in isolation from the second, Dr. Messenger's work, completed by the second volume now under review, is an achievement of thorough and painstaking research. Again and again in studying his seven hundred odd pages we are impressed by the width of his reading, both in respect of Catholic and Anglican authorities, by his clear grasp of principle, by his mastery of intricate detail and his lucid summarizing of the complex facts of an historical situation. An Anglican reviewer of his first volume remarked "that it might seem strange that Roman theologians should still find it necessary to take pains to substantiate the statements of the Bull *Apostolicae Curiae* forty years after its promulgation" [Theology, Sept. 1936, p. 138.] The number of misconceptions and incorrect assertions still current in both Anglican and Catholic literature on the subject has, however, made this further and exhaustive survey necessary. It is still asserted, for instance,

that Edwardine ordinations were accepted as valid by the authorities during the Marian restoration, and the theological application of the doctrine of intention in the Bull *Apostolicae Curae* is still widely misconceived.

Dr. Messenger has succeeded in showing that there is no ground for the assertion concerning the Edwardine ordinations and that in all the alleged cases these orders were treated as invalid and re-ordination was absolute. The supposed rehabilitation of John Scory, Bishop of Chichester, by Bonner is particularly interesting as showing how long an error, due to the exercise of a little imagination on the part of its first perpetrator, may persist and be repeated and to what shifts our own controversialists have been driven in their efforts to evade what appeared to be an awkward case, but which in reality was non-existent. As to the question of intention an exhaustive enquiry reveals that up to the last revision of the Prayer Book in 1662 no Anglican divine held the doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice in any form which was consonant with the Catholic doctrine as it had gradually developed in the course of centuries and as it had come to be formulated in the tradition of the Church. Moreover the compilers of the Anglican Ordinals and Communion services excluded in every case the many explicit references to sacrifice which occurred in the old Pontifical and Missal. Only in one prayer in the new Communion-service of 1552 did the word sacrifice occur, and then in so ambiguous a form that it could not be taken as certainly implying the Catholic doctrine. Thus in the newly-compiled sacramental forms of the Edwardine Ordinals the sacrificial office, as understood by the Church was not included in the Anglican conception of the episcopate and priesthood; in consequence a new intention was embodied in the ancient words, which was not the intention of Christ or of the Catholic Church.

A valuable part of Dr. Messenger's second volume is the essay in which he summarizes the conclusions of Western theology concerning the necessary form and intention of the Sacrament of Order. He points out the bearing of the whole rite (as embodying the intention of the Church) upon the

meaning of the words used in the form, and shows how the Bull *Apostolicae Curae* admits by implication that a formula of ordination, not sufficiently explicit in itself might have its meaning determined by the surrounding prayers of the rite. He goes on to show that it is precisely at this point that the deficiency of the Anglican Ordinals lies, since in the surrounding prayers of the rite the omissions and alterations, which constitute their difference from those of the ancient Pontifical on which they are based, introduce into them an ambiguity (at the very least) concerning the essential nature of the office they were intended to confer; so that no remedy for the *in se* insufficiency of the formulas themselves can be sought for in any determination the surrounding prayers could give them. This is a point of the first importance often overlooked by both sides in the controversy.

Judged then as a discussion of the intricacies of a theologicohistorical problem which has been isolated from its wider context Dr. Messenger's two volumes are of great value and as an exhaustive statement of our position are likely to be final. Judged, however, by the second aim which we have postulated as necessary their value is open to some questioning. The old method of controversy which was content to state a case without attempting to enter into the mind and outlook of the other side is not an effective means to-day of promoting the claims of the Catholic Church, however ably the case may be stated. A new spirit and a new technique of approach is in possession. This demands a careful probing into the historical roots of our differences and a sympathetic understanding of the whole doctrinal tradition of those who differ from us, how and why it arose and what truths it lays emphasis upon and in emphasising perhaps distorts into error. Viewed in the light of this new method of approach to the problems of divided Christendom a discussion of Anglican Orders apart from the wider problem of the nature and claims of ecclesiastical authority is likely to be a putting of the cart before the horse unless an understanding of the background against which an Anglican looks at the question is at least implied in it.

It is here, so it seems to us, that Dr. Messenger is least

successful. Many Anglicans contend that the Reformation owed its origin to a movement away, not from the true doctrine of the Church, but from a distortion of it in popular idea and practice, due to the spirit of the age, which obscured the true nature of the Church as the community of grace-filled members of Christ's Body. Subsequent heresies concerning grace and the Sacraments had their roots in this distorted conception. The movement, through lack of guidance, became a revolt and the revolt ended, as revolts so often do, by marring what it had set out to amend. This contention is of sufficient weight to merit close consideration on the part of Catholics, and an attempt to discuss Reformation history without taking it into account is unlikely to carry conviction with Anglicans.

Throughout his book Dr. Messenger appears to imply that the Reformation in England followed exactly the lines of its Lutheran or Calvinistic counterparts on the continent, and that the tradition of the Church of England was in all essentials identical with that of Continental Protestantism. To support this implication he considers it sufficient to prove that the sacrificial doctrine of the Eucharist and the priesthood was rejected by the Anglican reformers and the "evangelical" doctrine of Continental Protestantism adopted. Even apart from the fact of the wide divergence between the Lutheran and Calvinistic traditions this view of the situation appears to us to be an unhistorical simplification. It is true that the leading Reformers were strongly influenced by their brethren on the Continent, that under this influence the Catholic doctrine of the Mass and the Priesthood was reduced to heresy, and that this found considerable expression in the new service books, but it is also true that among the rank and file a deep reverence for historic Christianity, and in particular for patristic theology, became part of the tradition of the Church of England from the beginning. This tradition is first visibly embodied in Richard Hooker, and it was carried on and developed by the Caroline divines. It issued, in opposition to Lutheranism and Calvinism, in a doctrine of grace which was substantially orthodox and as a corollary of this in a doctrine of the Church, which though

imperfect did lay emphasis on the sacramental idea and on that of incorporation into Christ's mystical body. Thus the main body of the Church of England,³ though it rejected the sacrificial conception of the Mass and the priesthood, retained, in a way that Continental Protestantism did not, a doctrine of grace and of the Church which is potentially Catholic. The flower was cut off, but the roots were left; it is hardly surprising therefore that to-day the flower is blossoming again and Catholic sacramental doctrine is establishing itself within the Church of England.

What the future holds in store no one can predict; yet it can hardly be doubted that the anxious desire for a re-united Christendom of which Oxford and Edinburgh are witnesses is the work of the Holy Ghost. If it is Catholics must have some part to play in it and must not disdain to learn from those who do not share their communion. The chief lesson the ecumenical movement can teach us is that to-day it is useless to hammer away at our differences *in vacuo*; they must be fully related to all the historical circumstances from which they arose. In an atmosphere of controversy this is impossible; save in exceptional circumstances truth will only emerge as truth in a psychological atmosphere generated by friendly contact and understanding. This atmosphere can only be attained by a determination on both sides to explore our differences to their roots. Since he has planned his work to deal with one of the surface problems of the situation and has dealt with it so ably, it may seem unfair perhaps to criticize Dr. Messenger for not going deeper. But it is seldom worth while treating symptoms unless you have first thoroughly probed their cause.

HENRY ST. JOHN, O.P.

³ The Puritan and Calvinistic tradition has always existed side by side with the main body in the Church of England. The Evangelicals of to-day, though they have lost much of their distinctive Calvinism are still marked by their Puritan antecedents.

CHRISTIAN SPAIN

ONE of the minor tragedies of the Spanish Civil War lies in the fact that Professor Dempf of Bonn was not able to give at Santander in 1936 his projected course of lectures on "Christian Political Philosophy in Spain." It is however no small compensation that he should have published these lectures, which are thereby communicated at present to all who understand German and, it is to be hoped, later to English-speaking readers.¹

And behind this there is a greater hope yet. In reading the book one cannot refrain from asking again and again, "Will Spain which has so magnificent a Christian tradition, which has produced so many of the world's greatest political theorists, succeed this time after the agony of revolution and martyrdom in realizing the noblest ideas in practice and returning to the authentic Christian and Catholic outlook in politics?" Or will it be as before—a noble idealism existing side by side with an unintelligent hard realism personified in the classical figures of Don Quixote and Sancho Panza? Dr. Dempf is content to remind us of the historic Spanish paradox, to express the hope that the Spanish people will rediscover themselves after the thunders of the civil war and then, as if preparing the way for return, to indicate with the insight and conciseness of a master the teaching of the great Spanish political theorists. For only by returning to the ideas built up by these men will Spain be able to re-establish a healthy political life.

It is not that the Spanish writers beginning with Vittoria advocate a party or political system which will solve all the world's ills. They are neither Liberal, Socialist nor Fascist, but they set forth those general principles which any government must observe in order to ensure social justice and honourable dealing both with its own subjects and with other nations. They, perhaps more than other group of writers, have built up a vast synthesis of political philosophy

¹ Alois Dempf, *Christliche Staatsphilosophie in Spanien*. (Anton Pustet, Salzburg. 6 Austrian schillings.)

which is comparable to the common-sense metaphysics of the schoolmen; Vittoria for instance develops the Thomistic teaching and applies the metaphysics and moral philosophy of the schools to the sphere of politics. And as a return to common-sense is the only way to solve any problem so the political problems of the day can ultimately only be solved by the common-sense philosophy of St. Thomas Aquinas. It is that philosophy which is represented (apart from slight differences of detail) by the Spanish theorists.

Thus, while it leads to no definite party-allegiance, this book quietly refutes the errors of all the parties in providing a system by which the philosophies behind them may be tested.

Rousseau, the father of nineteenth-century Liberalism, is easily refuted by the Christian idea of man as perfectible but as at present imperfect. Marxist materialism has to give way before the Christian teaching of the primacy of the spiritual, and Hegel and others who influenced Fascist statolatry are shown to have flagrantly contradicted the truth that the State exists for the service of man and not vice-versa.

This political *philosophia perennis* is all the more admirable on account of the fact that those who helped to form it were to no small extent influenced by the movements of their time. It is admirable because, while appreciating the spirit of their age, these Spaniards were able to elevate themselves to view the State and political life *sub specie aeternitatis* and insisted always on the permanent moral obligations and the primacy of the spiritual amidst the changes and chances of this material world's strife.

First in the list of the constructors of this synthesis of Christian political philosophy Dr. Dempf rightly places Vittoria, whose magnificent achievement in the realm of international ethics has rather tended to obscure his notable contribution to the theory of the State. In his political theory Vittoria had actually in view the then existent wide-stretching Empire of Charles V and the conquests of Spain in the New World—hence his ideas on the law of nations are to a large extent part of his philosophy of the State. In the

true Thomist tradition however he was first and foremost a theologian and his teaching is inspired by the mediæval conception of the *lex aeterna* as the exemplar to which all other law must be conformed. Hence the natural community of peoples on which he insists is not to be identified either with the Universal Church or with the Hapsburg Empire. The Church's authority is limited to her own members and then only from the point of view of the spiritual; Vittoria, a century before Bellarmine, rejected the Church's direct power in temporals. Nor was the Emperor to be regarded as Lord of the world; the right of national self-determination was also recognized by Vittoria.

The basis of the world-community is ultimately the same as that of the national community, the need of men for one another which is part of their nature, created by God, and which is satisfied by certain free acts. But the natural law is fundamental and positive law only secures its fulfilment.

The State is from God in so far as He endows man with the natural impulse to enter into organized society and is distinguished from the Church by its end, which is happiness in this world. But it should be so organized that other groups, the family and certain functional associations retain full autonomy in their own sphere; Vittoria is also an advocate of the corporative State. The material cause of the State is the people, in the sense that all authority is for their good and dependent on their determination. As they are responsible for their welfare and have to bear the ills that afflict the nation, they must be able to control the person whose governmental acts involve them in good or evil fortune. But his authority ultimately comes from God. It must be used therefore in accordance with God's law, the moral order and with respect to the whole community of nations. Thus did Vittoria refute the doctrine of Macchiavelli, though he had not, like the later and better-known Grotius, seen the pernicious consequences of Macchiavellianism.

Suarez, coming between Vittoria and modern times, living in an age when Christendom had been broken up through the Reformation and the religious wars, retained the

essentials of the Scholastic tradition in politics but stressed certain aspects in order to refute contemporary errors. Against regal absolutism he maintained the contractual theory which, though it is vastly different from Rousseau's idea of the social contract, is perhaps more than a development of Vittoria's teaching. It is very clearly set forth by a recent German writer² as corresponding in political theory to the Molinist teaching on Grace in theology and as being opposed to the Dominican (and, in the present writer's opinion, Thomist) view in the same fashion, through the greater emphasis on human freedom.

This is not to deny the great contribution which he made to Catholic political philosophy nor to suggest that he and his associates were not worlds removed both from absolutist and liberal errors.

Even Mariana's admitted error on the subject of tyrannicide is shown to be such that it does not by any means render the rest of his philosophy unsound. It was due as much as anything to his acute appreciation of the ruin to which an irresponsible prince might lead his people. But this he sought to avoid by teaching the necessity of good relations between prince and people, the moderation of absolutism and a healthy economic administration which would bring the benefits of a mercantile age within the reach of all.

Certain followers of Mariana bring to an end the golden age of Scholastic political philosophy and, in closing this section of his book, Dr. Dempf rightly claims to have shown that there is a *philosophia perennis* on the fundamentals of which all these varied writers are agreed and that they were successful in re-establishing the permanent principles by their treatment of actual problems. "From the discovery of America to the rise of Mercantilism Spanish State-philosophy treated with astounding unanimity and sought to solve all the questions which arose at the opening of modern times." (p. 127.)

The last of the great Spaniards of whom he treats is unfortunately little known in England—Donoso Cortes, who was

² Heinrich Rommen, *Der Staat in der katholischen Gedankenwelt*. (Bonifacius-Druckerei, Paderborn, 1935.)

Spanish Ambassador in Berlin in the middle of the last century. The time and place are both important, for here again we have a teacher who recalled the perennial philosophy of the State to solve the questions of the day which were profoundly affecting him. He saw the revolutionary movements of '48 and appreciated their lasting significance, he prophesied the rise of the masses, saw the ultimate struggle to be between Catholicism and Socialism and announced that the revolution which would change the face of Europe would begin either in London or St. Petersburg.³

As a contemporary of Kierke Gaard, with much of the latter's spirit, and in the fashion of De Maistre, Schlegel and Görres, he can be regarded as a lay-theologian or, better still, as a Christian philosopher, seeking to refute the errors inherited with all their practical consequences from the *Aufklärung* of the previous century. It is because he rejects rationalism that he is so implacable a foe of political Liberalism. Against the rational, naturalist view of the world, he takes up his standpoint from God's outlook and insists on the supernatural as the peak of a hierarchic order of things. He does not advocate a theocracy and in the truest Catholic spirit he is prepared to be loyal to any properly established régime which secures order in the State, but he prefers a system which will ensure the maintenance of supernatural values in their most perfect form. The best form of sovereignty is that which unites the various groups (again the corporative idea) in the one area and into one nation "whose symbol is the throne and whose personification is the king," and brings this nation along with other Catholic national units each with their Christian sovereign into the communion of the Church which gives order to the whole, "one through its supreme head, manifold in its members."

There is a failure to appreciate facts behind this grandiose conception, but it is expressive of a healthy desire to restore

³ See Franz Schnabel, *Deutsche Geschichte im neunzehnten Jahrhundert*, Vol. IV. pp. 170-172, (Herder, Freiburg-im-Breisgau, 1937) for an excellent appreciation of Cortes.

balance to society and to combine reasonable freedom with proper authority. Undoubtedly, too, Cortes is correct when he sees the cause of actual political and social disorder to be in the last resort religious error.

There is little opportunity for political theorizing in the midst of civil war and the chaos which the latter leaves behind it demands the utmost strictness on the part of the established government. To set up an order corresponding to the principles laid down by the Spanish philosophers is impossible during the war and will be very difficult for a long time after it. But is there any hope of this? Is the struggle to end only with the extinction of Catholic Spain or will the nation continue to labour under the same cruel paradox (or rather, contradiction) between ideal and reality?

Certainly, if those who claim to support the Valencia government are successful there is no chance of their realizing the Catholic ideal of the State. But as it does not seem likely that they will be victorious, what can be expected from Franco? He has established order in the greater part of Spain even in the midst of present difficulties, he has spoken—and it seems sincerely—of his intention to promote social justice and revive the authentic Catholic spirit of Spain, there are evidences of his respect for the hierarchic order outlined by Cortes and he hopes to restore a corporative system such as all these great teachers have admired. But it is not sufficient in these days to accept such declarations at their face-value; one has to ask, ‘‘What do these words mean?’’ For words, even holy words—as the Pope has pointed out in his letter on National Socialism, are used to-day in vastly different senses by the political leaders. One cannot but fear that the Spanish nationalists are more influenced by the spirit of Fascism than by the teaching of their own Christian philosophers. Even though it may now be absolutely necessary to take their side to re-establish some order in the State, it would not be easy to show that Vittoria would have justified the revolt in the first place. And though one may discount exaggerated stories about the bombing of Guernica, there can be no doubt that the conduct of the war

CHRISTIAN SPAIN

through the inhumanity of Franco's allies if not of his own immediate followers, could not possibly satisfy the conditions of Catholic Moral Theology. It is said that Franco has threatened to exile "political priests," an expression which at worst recalls the early days of Nazism and at best seems to be taking into the hands of the State a power which properly belongs to the Church. Lastly, there is such confusion of thought on the subject of corporativism that even the best-informed often seem to think that the Fascist corporate State is identical with the more democratic corporative system advocated by Catholic sociologists.

This is not to take sides against Franco but merely to give reasons why we cannot expect an ideal Catholic State to be formed at once after the struggle. We can however hope that what does emerge will ultimately form itself into a system more in accordance with the Spanish and Catholic tradition than anything that we see to-day and that the paradox will finally disappear through the reunion of the religious and national elements. In that restoration these teachers will certainly participate to no small degree and it will be mainly due to their influence if there returns the ancient spirit: *Hispanidad y Cristianidad*.

EDWARD QUINN.

RUSSIAN SOPHIOLOGY
(II)

It is commonly thought that gnostic systems are grounded upon a dualist conception of the origin of the Universe, but this is subject to question. Gnosticism was the source of many religious and philosophical movements in nowise marked by dualism, suffice it to recall Clement of Alexandria and Origen, and later the mediaeval adepts of secret teachings who, through many perversions, were seeking for the one Divine Absolute. Dualistic elements, more or less marked in different gnostic systems, co-existed with a monistic element often predominant.

In Christianity pure dualism, *i.e.*, the essential and primordial opposition between two distinct principles, has existed only within Manicheism which owed its origin to Persian Mazdeism. Before Manes this Persian dualism had only an indirect influence upon the great syncretistic movement of the Hellenic world. Actually this term—dualism—is applicable only there where the principle of evil is considered to be in its origin independent of its opposite—the principle of good. In the gnostic systems the evil principle is the outcome of a slow evolution proceeding from a unique First Principle. These systems are essentially monistic, differing one from another precisely by the way they conceive this creative evolution resulting in an inferior world and its final reintegration into the Godhead. The ancient gnosis, with its multiple systems, was an effort to connect the actuality of the material world with the divine transcendence. Modern Russian thinkers are concerned with the same problems. Gnosticism originated outside Christianity, but borrowed its soteriological doctrine as a basis for speculations closer to pantheism than to dualism, and it is within this pantheist evolution that the idea of *Sophia*, link between the unknowable and the actual, originated. The rebirth of this idea is now something more than a fortuitous likeness or a borrowed terminology: beyond the similarity

of terms there is an affinity of thought, the same tendencies towards a synthesis of monism and pantheism with latent elements of dualism.

In order to show the identity of the ways which led the ancient pagan syncretism to gnosticism and the Christian syncretism of Russian modern philosophy to identical conclusions, we must compare these systems, ancient and modern, on the strength of the imperfect and fragmentary data we possess upon gnosticism. We shall briefly sketch Valentinus' sophiological teaching and the systems of the Ophites and Basilidians, elements of which reappear in Valentinianism.

The Ophites are the first to speak of *Sophia* as the creative principle deriving from the divine Unknowable. In one of the systems summarized by St. Irenæus¹⁷ these Ophites differentiated between the *Primum Lumen*, also called *Primus Homo*, his co-eternal thought—*Filius Hominis* or *Secundus Homo*, lastly a third essence the Spirit or *Prima Femina, Mater viventium*. *Primus Homo* and his Son, enraptured by the beauty of the Spirit-woman, illumined her by their rays thus producing a new Light, the Third man or the Christ who, united to the Spirit-woman produced the *Sancta Ecclesia*, depositary of all divine potentiality. In this first manifestation of creative power within the ineffable Godhead there is an overflowing surplus of divine light, this surplus is *Sophia*, creative Wisdom. By one of her aspects she participates in the superior divine light, but in the cosmic element created by her she has an inferior essence which is the *femina a femina*, the passive matter, wherein the great cosmogonic drama is to be enacted directed by Ialdabaoth, *Sophia's* son, identified with the Biblical Jahve.

Basilides' system,¹⁸ permeated by a more marked

¹⁷ The principal sources for the Ophites are: St. Irenæus, *Adv. haer.* I, xxx; Clement of Alexandria, *Stromata* vii, 17; Theodoretus, *Haer. fab. comp.* I, xiv; Origen, *C. Cels.* vi, 24, *seq.*; Epiphanes, *Haer.* xxxvii; Philaster, *Haer.* I; *Praedestinatus*, c. xvii; Ps.-Tertullian, c. vi; etc.

¹⁸ Principal sources for Basilides: Iren. *Adv. haer.* I, xxiv, xxviii; II, xiii, xvi, xxxi, xxxv, *etc.*; Hipp. *Philosophumena* vii, 14-27; x, 14; Just *Dial. c. Tryph.* xxxv; Clem Alex. *Strom.* I, 21; II, 3-8, 20; III, I; IV, 12-26; V, I, II; VI, 6; *Excer. ex Theod.* xvi; Epiph. *Haer.* xxiv (xxxii); Euseb. *Hist. Eccl.* iv, 7; Theodor. *Haer. fab. comp.* i, 4; *Acta Archel.* lxvii-lxviii; Orig. *Hom. in Luc.* i & xxix. *In Matth.* xxxviii; etc.

pantheism (Buddhist influences may be detected in it) places *Sophia* among the eight primary divine emanations, the higher *Ogdoad*, the names of which are: The Father (Πατήρ), the Spirit (Νοῦς), the Word (Λόγος), Reason (Φρίκητος), Strength (Δύναμις), Wisdom (Σοφία), Justice (Δικαιοσύνη) and Peace (Ειρήνη). This is pure abstraction and Sophia plays no part in the further development of Basilidian cosmogony, she is not its creative principle which Basilides sees in the First Cause, the inconceivable mystery of the impersonal divine essence, so remote from creation and any manifestation that it is non-existent for the world, it is the *non-ens-Deus*, the *οὐκ ὁν Θεός* which contains, however, the germ of being and the whole cosmic seed (*τὸν χάρτινον ταντοπερμίαν*). From this unfathomable mystery originates creative evolution of which the higher Ogdoad is the first emanation, or rather the first manifestation of the divine idea, the *fatherhood*, the second being the realm of the Son, the *ὑπότην* (*filietas* of St. Irenaeus' Latin text) which is the spiritual plane between the divine essence and the lower world, and the third *filietas*, wherein begins the evolution of created matter. Here Christ appears as a manifestation or incarnation in the man Jesus of the *Nous* of the higher Ogdoad, and through him the entire psychic element of the lower world will detach itself from matter in order to be reintegrated into the divine essence and the impassibility of the higher spheres impervious to suffering. Outside these spheres all is pain, thus final salvation lies in this impassibility, the "great unknowing".

It is easy to grasp why in this deeply pessimistic system *Sophia* could not become a creative principle co-eternal to God, for creation as such is but a deterioration of the divine principle, the evil and pain inherent in matter, which can be conquered only through the surrender of all desire and all knowledge, by a return to the immobility and impassibility of the impersonal divine essence. Thus Divine Wisdom is only an abstract faculty of the Godhead, devoid of any contact with the lower world.

In the teaching of Valentinus the sophiological doctrine

is the central point of a markedly optimistic system in diametrical opposition to Basilidian pessimism despite the fact that the structure of Valentinus' system approximates to the Ogdoad of Basilides and its ulterior developments.

Here this higher Ogdoad consists of two tetrads, each composed of two sygyzies. The inconceivable Abyss (*βυθός*) produces the Unutterable (*Αρρητον*) and Silence (*Σιγή*) from which emanate the Father (*Πατήρ*) and Truth (*Αλήθεια*); from this first tetrad emanates the second: the Word (*Δόγος*) and Life (*Ζωή*), Man (*Ανθρωπος*) and the Church (*Εκκλησία*). From the *Logos* and *Life* emanate a decad of aeons, from *Man* and the *Church* a dodecad; thus the mystical figure of 30, the divine Plenitude (*Πλήρωμα*) is completed. These aeons are not hypostatized, they are pure abstractions reflecting the conceivable attributes of the inscrutable Godhead. Their successive emanation is produced by sygyzies and in each of these metaphysical couples we perceive a male principle, symbolized by an adjective (*Αγέρατος, Ακίνητος, etc.*), and a female principle, symbolized by a substantive (*Ησονή, Σύγκρασις, Μακαρία, Πίστις, etc.*). Obviously these female names represent potential passive powers, whereas the male names reflect the active principle of the divine attributes. The five sygyzies deriving from the *Logos* and *Life* symbolize the attributes of divine transcendency, whereas the six sygyzies forming the dodecad deriving from *Man* and the *Church* represent the creative principle, or rather the creature's contemplation of the divine Absolute. The last sygyzy of this dodecad is formed by the Desired (*Θελητός*) and Wisdom (*Σοφία*). Thus *Sophia* is here the last member of the *Pleroma*, limit of the divine essence proper, link between the Godhead and the creature, and through her begins the germination of the created world.

Sophia, contemplating enraptured the mystery of the ineffable First Principle, seeks to imitate it by the development of the creative power. God, being Love, created the aeons within the Godhead to have an object of love "as love is not love if there is no loved object" (*Philosoph.* vi, 29). Similarly *Sophia* desires to continue the further evolution of

spiritual powers, but since her power is only a passive principle (its active male principle having remained in the *Pleroma*) she can only evolve a passive substance, the germ of cosmic matter. She appeals to the *Pleroma* to free her from this grosser substance, and rescue comes through two new aeons specially emanated for the purpose: *Christ* and the *Holy Ghost*, who reintegrate her into the *Pleroma* leaving the cosmic embryo outside, whence the evolution of the lower world is to begin. The reflection of *Sophia* remains in it, and is the *external* or *inferior Sophia*, whence emanate seven cosmic powers which form with her the lower Ogdoad, that of the material world. These are the "seven pillars" of the House of Wisdom, headed by a Demiurge identified with the God of the Bible. It is he who creates man to the image of the heavenly *Anthropos*, and having created him, experiences an apprehensive admiration of his work which is shared by the other six cosmic powers, for man receives the spark divine from the higher powers. Jointly the *Pleroma* creates a new aeon, *Jesus*, to be the mystical spouse of the lower *Sophia*, and it is this aeon's reflection which comes to earth as the man-*Jesus* to end the domination of cosmic forces. Through him the inferior world learns to separate the spiritual element from matter and reintegrate it into the divine essence. This is the mystical marriage of the lower *Sophia* with the aeon *Jesus*, the Demiurge of the lower world becoming the "friend of the Bridegroom who rejoiceth with joy" (John iii, 29). A Valentinian hymn preserved by Hippolytus' *Philosophumena* sings the bliss of the created world illuminated by this hope: the Spirit shines in the world, matter adheres to the soul, the soul takes its flight heavenwards, the embryo in the mother's womb prefigures the mystical Fruit (the *Pleroma*) emanating from the divine Abyss; the world ripens for the great final harvest, the feast of beatitude.¹⁹

19 The sources for Valentinus are innumerable. We may quote especially Irenaeus *Adv. haeres.*, *passim*; *Philosophumena* vi, 3, 21-55; vii, 31; x, 13; Clem. Al. *Strom.* vii, 17; ii, 3, 8, 20; iii, 1, 7; IV, 9, 13; vi, 6; *Excerpta ex scr. Theod.*, *passim*; Tertull. *Adv. Valent.*, *passim*. *De praescr.*, etc.; Euseb. *Hist. Eccl.*, iv; *Praep. ev.* vi, 9 *sq.*; Just Mart. *Dial. c. Tryph.* xxxv; Epiph. *Haer.* xxxi-xxxvi, lvi; Theod. *Haer. fab. comp.* i, vii-ix, xii, xxii-xxiii; *Dial. Adam. De recta in Deum fide*, *passim*; etc.

This outline shows the analogy existing between these systems and the speculations of some modern Russians. The Christian trinitarian doctrine obliterated traces of metaphysical mythology expressed by ogdoads and tetrads, but something still subsists of the idea of a passive female principle completing the divine creative essence. Valentinus' sophiological conception was not more dualistic than that of Soloviev and Florensky, it devolved from a monistic aspiration which must not be overlooked despite its deformations. It is, we reiterate, pantheism striving to preserve the idea of a unique and transcendental divine essence. Dualism appears only in the opposition of matter to a spiritual or psychic element in the inferior cosmic spheres, and yet for Valentinus this matter is irradiated by the presence of the spiritual element. In this his doctrine is nearer Christianity than other gnostic systems, and a closer study of it manifests a rehabilitation of matter very similar to the deification of man and the cosmic element which forms the main thesis of these Russian speculations. Of these philosophers, as of Valentinus, it might be said that they are Platonists, but less dualistic than Plato.

Valentinians considered themselves Christians: Valentinus was a member of the Roman Church at the time when he disagreed with her (*semel et iterum ejectus*, says Tertullian, *De Praescr*, xxx); he even coveted a bishopric. His followers resented being treated as heretics. St. Irenæus' text is definite:

Hi (qui a Valentino sunt) enim ad multitudinem propter eos qui sunt ab Ecclesia, quos communes et ecclesiasticos ipsi dicunt, inferunt sermones . . . qui et jam quaeruntur de nobis, quod cum similia nobiscum sentiant, sine causa abstineamus nos a communicatione eorum, et cum eadem dicant, et eandem habeant doctrinam, vocemus illos haereticos: et cum dejecerint aliquos a fide per quaestiones, quae fiunt ab eis, et non contradicentes auditores suos fecerint, his separatim inenarrabile Plenitudinis suae enarrant mysterium. (Adv. haeres. III, xv, 2.)

So it was not in opposition to Christianity that Valentinians developed their esoteric teachings, but as a complement to the doctrine taught to the people—here we see again the close analogy between them and these Russians who believe

their sophiological philosophy destined to complete the official doctrine of the Church. The similarity with Valentinianism is not superficial but deeply rooted in a kindred mentality.

By what channels did these gnostic influences filter into Russian religious thought? It is through Western occult sciences that traditions preserved throughout the centuries by esoteric teachings penetrated into Russia. In the East it was the thought of the great Byzantine mystics derived from Neo-Platonism, with reminiscences of ancient theurgy, which gave mystical contemplation a more concrete character, whilst Western mysticism was fed by philosophical speculations. The encounter of these two currents in modern Russian religious thought, compound of Western culture and Eastern tradition, has favoured the growth of ideas reminiscent of gnostic syncretism.

J. DANZAS, T.O.S.D.

Translator's Note. J. Danzas has incurred the bitter criticism of several writers (see Berdyaev in *Eastern Church Quarterly*, July 1937 and Dom Th. Wesseling in same magazine, October 1937) who deny any connection of modern Russian *sophiology* with ancient gnosticism. For those desirous of making a serious study of the question two recent Russian works are recommended, both unwittingly supporting J. Danzas' thesis. These are Fr. Florovsky's *The Ways of Russian Theology*, and Archbishop Seraphim Sobolev's *Fr. Bulgakov's Defence of the Sophianic Heresy before the Episcopal "Council of the Russian Church Abroad"* (Sofia, 1937). This latter work repudiates all Fr. Bulgakov says in his defence in his *memoranda* presented to Metropolitan Eulogius. The second chapter of this ably-written book examines the origins of modern *sophiology* and establishes its undeniable relation with Valentinian gnosticism. Archbishop Seraphim ends his book by the solemn declaration that "the *Sophianic heresy*" is a dangerous temptation demanding immediate and severe condemnation.

—OLGA BENNIGSEN.

ADVANCE IN RETROSPECT

THE business of preparation is complete. The men know what work lies in front of them, if life is spared, before the sun, now setting behind the steep roofs and towers of Bailleul, rises again above the fortified ridge of Messines, still held by the enemy. As the column leaves its high resting place on Mount Ravetsburg and winds on towards the darkening East, a ground mist veils the sordid straggle of wreckage in the valley, where heaped debris of earth, metal and smouldering timber had once been trains of linked trucks loaded with explosives. A chance bomb dropped from the air yesterday had blown wagons, wheels, rails, sheds and men skywards in blasts of flame.

The thick dust stirred by the movement of many men fills eyes, mouth and nose, for the grass underfoot that once carpeted the country lane has been crushed out of life, and the earth that fed it has been powdered by the tread of innumerable feet. Yet the June evening is still redolent with hawthorn; and the scent of the hedgerows softens the acrid impact of sweat. Shellfire has not yet violated the virginity of trees in full leaf; and the eye lingers on their shapeliness as if to stamp their form on the mind. Within an hour the memory of them will seem as fantastic as the prospect of the trees further ahead which stand with stark limbless trunks pared of life-giving foliage by the engines of war.

The vibrant note of a homing aeroplane and the muffled beat of occasional gunfire seem to emphasize the stillness of the twilight. The land as it falls away in front flickers with red flashes, which delineate the girdle of defence round Ypres. Suddenly the senses take the familiar shock of explosion: the sky glares and coruscates with the burst and crackle of munitions stored in the graveyard of Neuve Eglise, where a well-directed shell has set them prematurely ablaze to the discomfiture of its peaceful tenants.

In the valley of Wulverghem many guns are just discernible, stalled wheel to wheel along the lynchet under the eastward rise. While the column halts, figures pass this way and that through the mist that covers the low ground and retains a deceptive vestige of daylight in its thin white

shroud. A train of limbered wagons bumps over the rough ground with a jingle of harness, and a huddle of tanks that have just shed their netted camouflage start to feel their way stealthily ahead.

Falling into single file the column is engulfed in a trench heavy with the smell of freshly turned soil. In front shoulders humped under the load of battle equipment, and close walls of clay rising at either hand high above the head imprison the eye, until the fortunes of dawn may chance to grant the consolation of a wider view. Rest comes in the deep assembly lines with their pattern of bay and traverse. Scaling ladders are set ready on their eastern face. The constellations wheel in silence round the night sky, carrying with them the irrevocable minutes until the hands of men's watches mark the hour of three. There is the stir of cramped limbs, the murmur of final encouragement and farewell, and the long hidden lines of armed men stand grouped at the foot of the ladders.

Ten minutes after the hour—zero—the instant between waiting and action. The sky lights up with myriad tongues of flame. Body and soul are stricken with a cataract of sound. The ladders tip over and the men are flung off their balance as the trench reels to and fro on the unstable lap of an earthquake. The ground in front to left and right bursts open and vomits its soil skywards with a deep rumble of thunder that drowns the battering tattoo of the guns. Men clamber heavily up the sides of the trenches which have collapsed under the shock of many exploding mines; they move eastwards across the torn earth, following the crashing wall of the barrage as it pounds destructively forward foot by foot. Rockets green, red, and gold stream up from the bombarded lines, wreathed in a mist that glows dully red and is curdled with heavy wreathing smoke. Once across the bridges that span the old front line the way underfoot is less treacherous in the green untrodden belt of No Man's Land. The burst of shells all round and overhead and a rain of iron fragments warns the men advancing to ease their pace, for they lie too close to the barrage of the supporting guns. Soon the way becomes heavy and tortuous. Festoons of rusty wire, cruelly barbed, catch at the legs as the men pass carefully across hummocks and craters churned up by the days of incessant bombardment.

The first objective is passed unnoticed; it has been smashed out of recognition. A small grey figure detaches itself from the grey pall. It is an elderly man unarmed and bewildered. He stops short at the point of a bayonet. Hearing no word he can understand, he fumbles at the pocket of his grey tunic and draws from it a peace offering. It is a paper packet of cigarettes, and it bears on its label the word "*Tattersall's*." Sanity sired by Humour out of Laughter is reasonably purchased at the price of a spared life. The little man, still bewildered, stumbles instinctively towards the security of a cage. Dawn discloses the second objective, a battered, shapeless, untenanted ditch. Files of men wander by and begin to climb the ridge still hidden by the mist and the smoke of the barrage which pilots their advance with the close attention of a child bent on breaking to pieces everything within its reach.

The sharp crack of rifles fired close at hand and the thud of a bullet that smashes the bone of a man's arm quicken the mind to action. Heads are seen and known by the deep steel helmets that protect them. A handful of men with their rifles are still defending a pitiful fragment of trench under the lee of a stout concrete shelter. At the peremptory chatter of a Lewis gun they go below ground. Bombs thrown into the trench drive them to cover. From a hidden recess inside the shelter they defend themselves with pistols fired at those who break in and would have them surrender. Inside the low doorway is a pyramid of ammunition; "pineapple" grenades, stick bombs and boxes of bullets topped with signal rockets. A Verey Light discharged point blank sets fire to them. The shelter becomes an inferno of crackling reports and detonations, as innumerable bullets furrow the ceiling and walls and floor in their glancing eccentric flight. The deafening clang of the bursting grenades and the rush of the flaming rockets which fly with wild frustrated energy round the tiny space leave the defenders no chance of life. The massive concrete traps them in a close mesh of torture that sears, burns and suffocates. Three other shelters change hands without violence, for their defenders at a word come readily into the open with raised hands.

The view widens as the rising sun disperses the mist and discloses a brown waste of desolation. There is time to count

the dead, dispose the living afresh and reflect on the chance of battle with rediscovered friends. Hunger and thirst tyrannize the first moments of relaxation. The man who has cooked for many months and in many places is already at his work. A bullet skims the ridge, and in its dropping flight lodges in his throat and kills him, as he kneels to tend the little fire and watches the water. The tea is made and a lark sings high overhead in the sunlight. The solace of both brings forgetfulness of the fighting that has passed far out of sight beyond the ruins of Messines.

AELWIN TINDAL-ATKINSON, O.P.

ART AND PRUDENCE¹

COMPARING his own book with M. Maritain's *Art and Scholasticism*, Mr. Adler says of the latter that it is "for me the best analysis of fine art." He continues: "The scope of that is more general than this. I am concerned primarily with one problem and, moreover, with that problem as it occurs in the special case made by the cinema as a fine art. The attempt to apply everything that is relevant in the intellectual tradition to this contemporary problem necessarily requires some interpretation and extension of the basic texts I have relied upon. To this extent, and only to this extent, my work has been constructive." These words of the author fully outline the scope and nature of his work, but not I feel, with the right emphasis.

The book, with its seven hundred pages of texts and notes, may be only "an interpretation and extension of basic texts," but the result is almost of a different order to the sources of his texts. Without wishing in the least to underestimate the importance of his sources, it would be more accurate to see in this a work of a different kind, and something of equal importance.

In keeping alive an intellectual tradition, there are two things to be considered: content of ideas, which of itself is the lifeless part (a mohammedan could be more agile in the theology of the Holy Trinity than a canonized saint), and the power to recognize those ideas in actual facts.

The tradition that began with Aristotle was one primarily of obedience to fact. When it reached a moment of synthesis in the thought of St. Thomas it was through severe reverence for the same principle. To carry on that tradition it is not sufficient to hand on a parcel of ideas, to restate them in the idiom of the day; they must be recognized over again in the new set of facts. Otherwise the tradition is beached high and dry and becomes a matter of the reason only, while in practice events swing from extreme idealism to extreme materialism.

The great value of this book lies in its obedience to fact. Avoiding doctrinaire philosophy, the author has approached

¹ *Art and Prudence* by Mortimer J. Adler. (Longmans, Green & Co., New York. \$5.00.)

near to the true spirit of Aristotle and given to his work great appeal.

Mr. Adler has two things to help him: his own scientific bent of mind, and the limitations of his particular problem, that of the control of the cinema as part of the life of the State. To do this he "applies everything that is relevant." He draws upon two main sources: what has been said in the past, and the existing conditions to-day. Without appealing in the void to what should be, he is able with detached and penetrating analysis to trace the course of the problem of the censorship of the arts from its source in the conflict between Plato and Aristotle, and to build up from the subsequent history of the problem a positive position, made all the more secure by being built upon skilful suggestion rather than upon theoretic analysis, culminating in the thomism of M. Maritain. Against this background he then examines the present position, and is able to make a very balanced judgment on what has become an issue of major importance for those concerned with the welfare of social life. It is significant that his conclusions, which he rightly claims to be made as part of an intellectual tradition, have an air of deeper thought and greater dignity than many of the pronouncements made on the subject.

To use his own words:

"In proportion to their extraordinary popularity, motion pictures have aroused, during their relatively short career, contemporary Platonists of all sorts, Churchmen who are Platonists as well as Christians, politicians who are Platonists as well as democrats, parents who are almost always Platonists about their own children. The Platonic position about the arts, about drama, about the movies, cannot be answered by aesthetes who talk about art for art's sake, or by liberals who worship liberty as if it were the only good or even a good in itself. It is met, in sound controversy, only by Aristotelians. The issue about the movies must be understood, whether or not it is practically solved, in terms of Aquinas against Bossuet, Dewey against Rousseau. We have surveyed the great moments and turns in this dialectic about art and prudence in order now to be able to analyse the contemporary controversy in such a way that we can at least formulate an intelligible practical problem; in order to reduce a huge field of ill-expressed and rhetorically exaggerated opinion to the few simple, clear points which can be made; in order to discover what knowledge we have that justifies action and what knowledge we need to act more intelligently and hence more prudently."

As must be inevitable in a work of this kind, it makes very uneven reading. The average reader will find tedious the long and detailed summaries of evidence. Other parts are just as crisp. It might even be advanced as a criticism of the book that its various sections are really different books bound within the same cover. Certainly the main merits here noted would have been more spectacular in a more generally discursive and shorter book. But it would have been a different book, not serving the author's present purpose at all.

It might be argued too, that he reads a little too much into Aristotle. I should think it fairly certain that Aristotle would not himself have been quite so articulate about the full meaning of his "imitation" and "catharsis" as is here implied. But it would be pedantic to make that point and leave the matter there. The very ingenious interpretation he puts upon those passages of Aristotle are the last word in aesthetic theory. Once understood they are seen to be inevitable. It does not really matter very much how conscious Aristotle was of the full meaning of his words. The main point is that the meaning is in his words, because he was analyzing fact and not speculating on hypotheses. A full account of the human body would more than imply the soul. What is started on the right lines can never be proved by subsequent development to be wrong.

However, we shall find the *Poetics* disappointing, and lamentably jejune as an aesthetic treatise, if we expected to find any of the jargon and tenseness to which we have become accustomed. Nevertheless, it is deeper, more accurate and nearer to reality.

Aristotle begins from fact. He is not primarily concerned with the abstract rightness or wrongness. The basis of his quarrel with Plato was that he objected to a clean sweep and an attempt to say what should be, without reference to what is and to what had been. Art begins from the human desire to imitate, and, analysing that word, and its correlative, purgation, we have the structure of a theory of artistic creation and intuition of the beautiful, though set in what Kant would have deplored as the lower reaches of the subject. Instead of talking in terms of the intuition of being, he speaks of the purging of the passions. No wonder Mr. Adler regrets that we have neglected the *Poetics*. And with what obvious harm to ourselves. A little appreciation of

the importance of passion-purging might have averted so much. Think of all the public statuary, of all the dull acres of wall-space in public buildings, of the vast amount of "serious" verse, that would never have been made had we remained, in our artistic tradition, purgation-conscious. There would never have been any "high-brow" tradition.

Indeed, Aristotle was quite consciously aware of that point. He clearly wanted to talk about the art that belonged to man, and not to the best men. And he begins by remembering his own words that "all men delight in coarse pleasures." There is only sense in which a Brandenburg Concerto is higher art than Mr. Groucho Marx. The unfortunate thing is that art theories, made on strictly Brandenburg lines usually, imply by silence the non-existence of Mr. Marx. Aristotle, however, began with him; and that, after all, is being aware of the more obtrusive fact.

At root, there is a deep metaphysical principle involved; that both matter and form have rights. Both are principles and exercise control over being. It means having respect for what has been called "the mystery of matter that comes up from below." Not to have it leads to facile generalisations, to the divorce of thought from reality, to complete preoccupation with what should be and growing blindness to what is, with the result that the dialectic of events proceeds untroubled by such thought. It is precisely this misunderstanding that is avoided in this book.

MARK BROCKLEHURST.

A FIFTY YEARS PLAN

WE all know that Great Britain is suffering from some ill. We are all becoming rather tired of all the examinations of this fact and of all the cures. Generally we find that the "doctors" are only concerned with bolstering up present economic order by removing the more glaring evils. We find Communists and Fascists all opposing capitalism with another form of capitalism in which they will be the capitalists.

Very rarely do we find anyone questioning the fundamental issues on which Great Britain and the Empire have been built.

We know we have lost a great proportion of our export trade, but we hope to recover it. Few of us ask if this is possible.

Now we have a distributist¹ examining the sick—Great Britain, and wisely pointing out the fallacies of the treatment prescribed by other doctors. In the first part of this booklet we find all the causes; "Small minority possessing property and the vast proletarianised majority . . ." "The deadly effect of urbanization possesses a profound biological significance." "Only a minute fraction of the population is engaged in work on the land . . ." "England's industrial monopoly is on the wane . . ." "The beginning of a process which will end in England possessing but a fraction of its present population; and of that fraction, half will be mentally deficient . . ."

Having found the disease Fr. Witcutt removes two of the false remedies from his path: Communism and Fordism. He rejects Communism for many reasons, because it would replace Capitalism with an undesirable society, because its change would be too sudden, and because it does not meet the particular ills that Fr. Witcutt finds, such as excessive urbanization. Quoting Ford and Chase he shows that super-capitalism is working towards a society in which photo-electric cells will replace workers.

Then comes the cure. It proposes setting up in Great

¹ *Dying Lands*, by W. P. Witcutt. (Distributist League; 6d.)

Britain an "economic dualism." Under this, which is based on a "50-year plan," the South of England and the Birmingham area would continue as at present. Wales, Scotland and the North of England would be new economic units. Such units would be organized to support their population by (a) developing unused land by means of intensive agriculture, and (b) by what export trade remains, and (c) a decentralization of industry and the diffusion of its ownership.

There is obviously a lot of truth in the cure. England must be prepared to cease exporting on the scale she has for the past hundred years. She must expect to cease drawing a large rentier income from the rest of the world. She must realize that with electricity the large manufacturing plant is not the only means of production in most industries.

But why separate the prosperous south from the derelict north? Why allow the south to rid itself of its responsibilities for the poverty-ridden north?

Surely it is as easy to persuade the Parliament of Great Britain to agree to the cultivation of our unused land, the promotion of smaller industries and the spreading of ownership, as to persuade Parliament to agree to a decentralization that will involve these points? By adding decentralization into self-contained economic units to various good and useful reforms the task is made all the more difficult.

There seems to be one fundamental difficulty that has been overlooked. At present Great Britain is in the grip of the big business man, and this man would hate to lose any part of the home market. He is not going to smile sweetly and agree to such radical changes. How are the changes to be effected if this man and his friends are left undisturbed in the South.

There is a great deal of truth in the Marxist view. You can effect many many small changes, but suddenly there comes the point when the "change" is so violent that a new thing exists. Capitalism, as we have it to-day, will stand many changes, but never the changes advocated in this booklet. Great Britain must be treated as a whole, we must refuse to segregate parts. The whole must be indoctrinated with various changes until it is ready for such a sharp change that it is no longer Capitalism.

Why not advocate on a national scale the use of unculti-

A FIFTY YEARS' PLAN

vated land for the production of food, forbidding the "preservation" of large tracts of useful land for the pleasure of grouse shooting? Why not advocate a law forbidding any more industries to concentrate in London and Birmingham? Why not work for the spreading of industry throughout the country? Why not work for the building of small towns (and the subsequent destruction of much of our monster cities) with a small number of factories in the immediate vicinity? Why not make the agricultural labourers' life much better than it is so that the country is not the soul-depressing and health-killing area that it is, from the workers point of view?

Probably very many Catholics will object to Fr. Witcutt's ideas, but it would be well worth their while to study the booklet, and if they do disagree to formulate exactly their objections. *Dying Lands* is the sanest book the present writer has read from the distributist angle. In fact he began it with a strong bias against all things distributist, and ended by thinking that there is a lot in what Fr. Witcutt says.

R. P. WALSH.

EXTRACTS AND COMMENTS

SAINT DOMINIC AND COMMUNISM. Under this heading Père Chénو, O.P., comments in *LA VIE INTELLECTUELLE* on the latest Papal Encyclical. We translate freely:

Politicians have had something else to smile about. While nations are being torn by violent ideological tempests, while economic instability delivers millions of men over to daily agony, while the armaments race destroys our hopes of peace, while open towns are being bombarded, Holy Church, in this tragic month of October, 1937, lifts her voice to propose . . . the recitation of the Rosary! What a feeble weapon!

Let us confess that when we read in the papers the other day, alongside accounts of the Hitler-Mussolini meeting and the bombardment of Shanghai, the extracts of the latest Papal Encyclical, we could not resist a first impression of pathetic weakness, a sense of unreality. So much are our Christian fervour and hope still bound up with confidence in purely temporal means!

Nevertheless, to justify his confidence in the power of this poor little weapon, Pius XI appeals to *facts*. This, he says, was the means employed by St. Dominic when, once before, popular enthusiasm for a new kind of society aroused half Western Europe against the existing social order and against Christian truth. Dominic made the people pray their *Paters* and *Aves*.

Perhaps some Christians, versed in history, think they can see in our time a new Simon de Montfort, a new "crusade" like the one patronized by Innocent III who sent his legate, Peter of Castelnau, to lead an army of "defenders of civilization," of the family, of property, against the "barbarians." Perhaps they will even look for a new Inquisition. No. It is none of these things that Pius XI advocates. Just the Rosary of St. Dominic. A little, simple, rather monotonous formula of prayer . . .

Europe then, as now, was in a state of ferment. Not only was there much external violence, but also, as in our own days, an epidemic of feverish pseudo-mystical enthusiasm combined with material pride and greed. Cathari, Vaudois, Waldenses, and many other sects whose names are now forgotten, preached an anti-social and anarchic gospel not unlike much communistic "mysticism" of the twentieth century. Pius XI himself remarks the resemblance. It is on account of this resemblance that he appeals for a renewal of the prayer of St. Dominic against the new Albigensians.

What was this prayer of St. Dominic? Amid all the turmoil

EXTRACTS AND COMMENTS

of the popular sects of his time, there really was a call, as yet but dimly understood, for a new order of society which would replace the decaying Feudal System. It is true that, in times gone by since the fall of the Roman Empire, the Feudal System had been the backbone of Western civilization. The Church herself had given a religious sanction to its oaths of vassalage. She had flourished on it, using the temporal power as an instrument for achieving her own spiritual aims; the great monasteries were themselves part and parcel of the system.

Yet the system had had its day; the privileges and power of the ruling classes were becoming petrified; new generations were arising in revolt. The interested parties of the old order offered resistance; the whole equilibrium of the social structure was threatened. Feudal lords, with prelates and abbots, associated (unconsciously without doubt) their jeopardized positions with the welfare of Christianity, and compromised divine truths with dying human systems, forgetting that even the most splendid of temporal civilizations are but fragile, passing supports for the mystical Body of Christ. The sectaries made the most of the situation, and found it easy to tar the Church and the old order of society with the same brush. It was easy to make the people laugh at the pompous legates sent against them with their brilliant equipage, wealth and armed forces.

Dominic, with the intuition which his sanctity gave him, understood the realities of the situation and the remedy it called for. He threw aside all the pomp together with the authoritarian social outlook which it symbolized. For him there were to be no large estates, no feudal power, no rich abbeys. He left the lonely valleys and the cultivated fields to dwell with his brethren in the working-class districts of the towns. He adapted for his brethren the suffrage system of government like that of the new Communes, and he made them join the new university Corporations. The mendicant poverty of the Dominicans enabled them to be independent, spiritually and socially, and so to invade the monopoly of the false mystics. The old-fashioned prelates were seriously disquieted at these goings-on, but the far-seeing Innocent III gave them his blessing and encouragement . . .

In this way we sons of St. Dominic are proud to be considered, as it were, the born adversaries of communism. We are proud to hear our holy Father the Pope proclaim the living efficacy in our own day of the prayer of our holy Father St. Dominic. We are proud to see that in our own day St. Dominic's method of independence from temporal forms of society has been made a fundamental law of all Catholic Action. Our Dominican refusal to ally ourselves with earthly powers and movements still arouses misgiving and even some protest . . . But our rosary is still the witness of our independence and the symbol of our fidelity.

THE MIRAGE OF FASCISM. The same number of *LA VIE INTELLECTUELLE* treats briefly of recent differences of opinion between *COLOSSEUM* and ourselves, introducing the subject with:

In England, *Colosseum* shares with *BLACKFRIARS* the merit of dealing with the utmost frankness with the study of the problems which the modern world sets the Catholic conscience. This is not always brought about without some controversy, but it is precisely the mutual respect and intellectual generosity which governs differences of opinion between these two reviews which is an example to French Catholics. *Colosseum* is "fascist"; *BLACKFRIARS* shows more independence with regard to the choice of political opinions to which its friends urge it.

There follow some extracts from recent *COLOSSEUM* editorials on the subject of Fascism and of "realism" in politics, which our French contemporary agrees with us in finding "disquieting." And then it gives an extract from a valuable letter from Dr. Waldemar Gurian in the September number of *COLOSSEUM*, the conclusion of which, for its own sake, is worth reproducing here:

No, Mr. Editor, it does not seem to me to be possible for the Christian of to-day to identify himself with a Party. As a Christian he cannot support the "Fascist" mentality. He must, as you rightly say, know who are his friends and who are his enemies, and the mere use of flattering expressions in regard to Christianity does not suffice to make a person the friend thereof. The Fascist restoration of authority and renewal of culture has nothing to do with the renewal of true authority and Christian culture. Secularization has only assumed new forms, struck a quicker tempo and one therefore more likely to deceive large numbers of people.

To-day the hour has come for a Christian revival—that is certain; not with the powers of this world but without them. The Christian must ask himself to-day whether his faith has not become too "worldly," whether he has not come to regard the Church too much as a power for promoting political parties and good situations. Certain it is that for our apocalyptic times (and even those who to-day are still living in peace and security will soon become aware of this mark of our times), the harmless belief in progress and cheap indignation at the fact that in the twentieth century the rule of violence based on the masses has raised its "monstrous head" are altogether out of keeping—but it is equally out of keeping to set our hopes on a Christian revival which begins to show itself in Fascism.

And so I would ask you to regard my letter as a protest against every sectarian mentality, be it of the Right or of the Left—since it is peculiar to every sectarian mentality to flee from the tension between the present and the immediate past, to forget the words “My Kingdom is not of this world” and “Thy Kingdom come.”

... For this kingdom is found neither in “social progress” nor in the strong totalitarian State. Neither the atheism of Karl Marx nor the atheism masquerading as religion of Dostoevsky’s “Great Inquisitor,” which determines the world to-day more than one thinks, can be regarded by the Christian as anything but trials of his faith.

The current number of *COLOSSEUM*, by the way, suggests that it is not quite so determinedly “fascist” or committed to *Realpolitik* after all. It contains many excellent things, including the full English text of M. Maritain’s *Sur la guerre sainte*, a fine rendering by Mgr. John O’Connor of Claudel’s *Aux martyrs espagnoles*, *The Desecration of the Artist’s Work* by Peter Wust, and *Modern Religious Art* by Nicolette Gray.

SOME QUARTERLIES. ARENA offers a good number devoted to analyses of Marxism in its various expressions and aspects; the whole issue is admirably conceived and edited, and should prove permanently useful so long as Marxism exists.—In a strong number of the DUBLIN REVIEW Douglas Duff writes on the Palestine imbroglio and the guardianship of the Holy Places; Mrs. Norman contributes an understanding introduction to Léon Bloy; W. A. Pantin is generous to Mr. Baskerville and writes an mediæval monastic scholarship; Michael Derrick’s enthusiasm for Dr. Salazar is almost infectious (but just how is it possible for this dictator to travel “as an ordinary citizen, hearing unrecognized the gossip of himself in the train or street”?); Waldemar Gurian describes current *Terrorism in the U.S.S.R.*; and Fr. Edward Quinn treats excellently on *Church and State in the Newest Age*.—From THE SOWER we extricate this good sense from a book-review:

My readers will remember a letter recently published in all the Catholic newspapers and signed by several distinguished Catholics deplored amongst other things “the reckless discussion” of social and economic problems. Obviously recklessness is to be avoided; but what, I am afraid, these gentlemen do not realise is that silence can be reckless too, in the sense that it

recks nothing of the growing feeling of injustice that is driving good men into the arms of the Communists. It was one thing to preach patience and endurance in the pre-industrial era when famine stalked abroad, when there was not enough food to go round, and when men tightened their belts that women and children might be fed; it is quite another thing to counsel restraint to men who have to walk the streets lined with well-filled shops and are denied the chance to earn enough to buy food because their work is not wanted. In these circumstances, which is the more dangerously reckless, to say that a way *must* be found and *can* be found to allow the people access to the surplus goods of the earth; or, to say that nothing can be done, that we are bound by the inexorable laws of economics, that dividends are more important than human beings, and that if food cannot be sold at a profit it must be destroyed and workless men must go without? Reckless? Did someone say, reckless? If the rich and the comfortably-off think that they can preserve the *status quo* by standing aside from this conflict they are living in a fool's paradise.

As usual, THE DOWNSIDE REVIEW is distinguished for the rare quality of its book-reviews.—CHRISTENDOM, on the other hand, is particularly disappointing in this respect this quarter; but there is ample compensation in an unexpected Nativity Play by Charles Williams, in *Evangelism and History* by J. V. Langmead Casserley (an uncommonly shrewd critique of current philosophies of history) and in V. A. Demant's *Philosophy of Church Social Action*.—THE CRITERION shows an unexpected concern for *The Plain Man and the Economists*; there is also a rendering of *Purgatorio Canto VIII* by Laurence Binyon. A passage from a book-review by the Rev. Charles Smythe runs:

About the Oxford Conference (July 1937)—the World Conference of the Churches (with the unavoidable exception of the Church of Rome) on Church, Community and State—least said may well be soonest mended. Heralded by the inevitable article by Professor Ernest Barker in *The Times* newspaper, it appears gradually to have assumed more and more the character of a Protestant ramp, or at least to have developed a very noticeable list in that direction. The Eastern Orthodox were notoriously unhappy and uncomfortable; the Catholics were embarrassed: and the Conference concluded with a signal exhibition of that generosity of heart and poverty of imagination which is liable to assail the Anglican Communion in its more portentous moments. But there is no use in crying over the spilt milk of human kind-

EXTRACTS AND COMMENTS

ness, which, fortunately, it never takes long to mop up. The Epilogue was very prettily spoken by the B.B.C., and included tactful references to the American business men whose presence at the Conference had been so much felt. And that (let us hope) is that.

Those of us who see a perilous "treason of clerks" in the unqualified partisanship of Right or Left on the part of the *élite* may feel some alarm at THE CRITERION'S reviews of current periodicals, entrusted to a Mr. Hugh Gordon Porteus. Except, it would seem, in the quarterly of the B.U.F., this gentleman sees nearly everywhere "a leftish attitude" whose "anchor is in Moscow." He finds that "the Catholic periodicals are "rather non-Communist than anti-Communist"(!) and detects "an apologetic and wheedling note, suggestive of a bad conscience where wealth is concerned . . . in the flirtations with Marxism of the 'younger' Catholic organs." His supreme contempt is reserved for BLACKFRIARS, which "has been skating for some time on the thawing ice of Marxism" and whose "editorial tone is almost ingratiating when it faces Left." One of our articles is "an attempt to show that His Holiness is not really so disgracefully anti-Red," and another "might have strayed from the pages of *Left Review*." Amusing enough in ACTION—but THE CRITERION!!!

CONTEMPORANEA. CHRISTIAN FRONT (Oct.): *The Capitalist Press*: a strong editorial.

CROSS AND PLOUGH (Michaelmas): *Art in England Now*: a broadcast by Eric Gill. *A Letter to the Land Movement* from Vincent McNabb, O.P.

ORATE FRATRES (Oct.): Karl Adam begins a series on *The Dogmatic Bases of the Liturgy*.

PAX (Oct.): *Incorporation in Christ*: first instalment of a promising theological essay on membership of the Church.

REUNION (Sept.): St. John (O.P.) before the Latin Gate. *The Setting of Papal Infallibility*: a paper read to the Oxford University Reunion Society by Victor White, O.P.

VIE SPIRUELLE (Oct.): A posthumous paper by Père A. Gardeil, O.P., on *Le Sens du Christ*.

PENGUIN.

CORRESPONDENCE

WORK AND PROPERTY

To the Editor of BLACKFRIARS,

Sir,—Fr. Ceolfrid Heron's very valuable and appreciative article in the August BLACKFRIARS, on my book *Work and Property*, invites a short comment. Misunderstanding seems to arise from my advocacy of "collective ownership" by the "workers." It is thought that such advocacy is out of line with adverse criticism of industrialism and the "leisure state." People ask: how can you be in favour of collectivism and of a return to responsible workmanship at the same time? How can you believe in distributed property and also acquiesce in industrialism? The answer is easy. I believe in workers' ownership of means of production and distribution. I believe in the village blacksmith (still one or two left) owning his own workshop and tools. I believe in the farmer owning his own farm and implements.

But what about the Great Western Railway? That also is an affair of workmen. Is it a bad thing? Is it immoral? Does the Pope refuse to go by train? And what about all the other great industrial enterprises? I may not like the kind of world they imply. I may be able to show that it is all wrong and leading to war and disaster—cheap amusements and conveniences, vulgarity on every hand, not to mention the corruption of family life, the destruction of humane culture and an increasing madness of international rivalry. But what of it? Does any theologian of importance condemn railway trains or telephones or tinned food? Does any theologian condemn the factory system, as such, or say anything against the wage system? As far as my information goes theologians ask for no more than good trade unionists do—higher wages, shorter hours, better canteens, insurance against ill-health and unemployment and possibly a share of the profits large enough to enable employees to buy a bit of property (if there's any for sale).

Very well then, I take it that no one wants the G.W.R. to be abolished. The question is: who shall own it? At present it is the legal possession of the shareholders. We all know what they're like. You read the finance pages of the daily papers. I say I believe in workers' ownership. Why should such a belief only apply to blacksmiths' shops, artists' studios and solicitors' offices? If it is good for me to own my workshop, why isn't it good for railway men to own a railway? And if I say these things, why should I be accused of going back on my vocation

CORRESPONDENCE

to teach in and out of season that the ownership and control of any enterprise is rightly that of those who have the responsibility of doing the work and making a good job of it? A porter cannot own a platform, a guard cannot own a railway carriage, a driver cannot own a locomotive—that's obvious. But they can collectively own the railway—that's obvious too. And as in our existing society the ownership of railways and such things is that of those whose only title is that they have lent money and whose only concern is the profit on what they've lent, it seems somewhat clearer than daylight that it is time we made a bit of a change. Who wants to make a change—a change in the direction of workers' ownership? The workers do—and very rightly and properly. And their demand is entirely in line with what I've always said—that the man who does the work ought to be responsible for it and that there can be no responsibility where there is no ownership. And as I pointed out in *Work and Property*, enlarging on the theme of Prof. Maritain in his *Freedom in the Modern World*, "the formal reason of individual appropriation is the exercise of art or work" and "the notion of person must be included in any complete theory of property." In our society we already have collective ownership—that of the shareholders. This is an impersonal ownership. The shareholder in relation to his holding is not a person; he is a receiver of dividends, if any. But porters and guards and engine drivers and foremen and clerks and managers are persons and they are personally responsible for the jobs they do. It is obvious that they ought to be the owners and controllers and that it is the money lenders who should be subordinate and powerless. If a man lends me money, I treat him as such, thank him politely and keep out of his way. I don't give him control of my job. I trust, sir, that all this is clear and that it will not again be thrown up against me that I have done anything but carry my "teaching" to its logical conclusion.

One thing more: May I say that I am sorry if, as one reviewer put it, I seem "to have been particularly unfortunate in the clergy of (my) acquaintance." The reverse is the truth. But I must admit that I share the opinion common among the masses who are "lost to the Church" that the clergy show some reluctance to condemn capitalism—production for profit, production for the sake of dividends.

Yours faithfully,
ERIC GILL.

Pigotts, High Wycombe.

Postscript.—It should be added, to avoid unnecessary correspondence, that when I say that the farmer, the craftsman, should own his own land, workshop, etc., I do not refer to that quasi

BLACKFRIARS

absolute ownership which goes to-day by the name of "free-hold." Ownership means control, personal control, but, definitely, control of good not evil, not for private aggrandisement, but in the interests of society and the common good—in the interest of the individual also, but of the individual as a member of society: "A man should not regard his material possessions as his own but as common to all . . ." Absolute ownership, implying a right to destroy or misuse or leave unused what is necessary to the good of others, is an evil myth. Therefore the ownership I mean is a tenancy, hereditary if desired, granted by responsible authority, enjoying the support and defence of public opinion and law, but implying specified duties and obligations as much as rights and carrying with it no opportunity for the exploitation of other people.—E. G.

TO OUR READERS

Enclosed with this copy of BLACKFRIARS is a leaflet, The Facts about Blackfriars. We should be very grateful to our readers if they would help us in any way to distribute it, and to make BLACKFRIARS more widely known. Copies of the leaflet may be obtained free and post-free on application to our publishers, The Rolls House Publishing Co. Ltd., 2 Breams Buildings, London, E.C.4. Please state how many you require.
—THE EDITOR.

REVIEWS

SOCIAL AND POLITICAL STUDIES

TOWARDS THE CHRISTIAN REVOLUTION. (Gollancz; 6s.)

Messrs. Gollancz throw a wide net in their zeal for man's welfare. They have caught a number of gentlemen, all belonging to the United Church of Canada, who in a series of essays, philosophical, theological, ethical, biblical and economic, bravely attempt to formulate the Christianity for the New Society. It emerges as an enlightened evangelicalism with a vivid sense of the sins of Capitalism. The authors, with what is perhaps a colonial sense of history, are dominated by two bug-bears: the Protestant business-man and Fascism. It is their reaction against these hated phenomena that conditions the shape of their Radical Christianity. The suppression of Fascism is to be the business of Politics. "The political task of our generation is that of preventing the rise of the totalitarian state in the remaining countries of the world and of saving civilisation from the devastation of war brought on by the desperate imperialist excursions of the fascist state." (p. 169.) Hence, presumably, the interest taken in Christian Politics by the organisers of Left enlightenment. Thoroughly modern, they are not unaware of the Thomist revival and the author of the first essay writes well on liberty, using Maritain. But one feels that it will be used merely to flog Fascism. English Left-wing courtesy is amusingly illustrated in the essay on *The Marxist Challenge*, in which the author after showing the points of contact between *real* Christianity and *real* Marxism, rather surprisingly remarks: "The Christian cannot, even if he would and this were the only alternative, join the Communist Party. He is debarred by a condition which would make him repudiate his Christianity." From which the publishers hurry down to a footnote, written for the English Edition by John Strachey: "I know of no such condition. The Communist Party welcomes Christians into its ranks." And if Mr. John Strachey re-read this book, he would still fail to see the condition. Sincere as they are, the authors play up to anti-capitalism and anti-fascism to such a degree that their Radical Christianity bears no resemblance to the Christianity that Marxism detests. Their limitation to merely the anti-acquisitive elements in the doctrine of Christ serves only to make their Christianity a useful element in their publishers' campaign.

It is interesting that when one of the authors indicates the religious public he hopes to reach Catholics are not mentioned. Faced with the Leisure State to which both capitalist and

socialist thinkers are logically forced to tend, the author of the final essay, *The New Society*, shows an astonishing facility in twisting certain Christian truths into line with current views. He succeeds only in compressing even Christ into the narrow limits of a best-seller. Christ becomes a futile prophet of the Ethic which only the Machine could make possible. Religious genius, he explains, was too busy with the spiritual ethic to work out its material implications. "It is part of the limitation of the Gospels that they ignore the technical problem" (p. 266). We are still so near to the industrial revolution and the machine age which it has prepared for us, that it intoxicates us. "Its more profound significance still escapes us. We are not yet aware that because it has ended the long centuries of scarcity it has at last brought within our reach the ethics of the garden, that it has laid the material foundations necessary for the Sermon on the Mount" (p. 270). These ethics, "which cast a moral stigma on worldly care will prove to be a brilliant forecast of the release of man's spirit in the machine age" (p. 279). All of which goes to show that the authors of this book have failed to deal either with Christianity or with Revolution.

CEOLFRID HERON, O.P.

REORGANIZATION OF SOCIAL ECONOMY. By Oswald von Nell-Breuning, S.J. English Edition prepared by Bernard W. Dempsey, S.J. (Coldwell; 15s.)

THE CONDITION OF BRITAIN. By G. D. H. and M. I. Cole. (Gollancz; 7s. 6d.)

THE PEOPLE'S FRONT. By G. D. H. Cole. (Gollancz; 7s. 6d.)

Reorganization of Social Economy is a bulky volume, comprising some 450 pages of very useful if somewhat tedious word-for-word commentary on the Encyclical *Quadragesimo Anno*. As is the way in word-for-word commentaries, there is a tendency to vain repetition and to much labouring of the obvious, while real problems suggested by, when not contained explicitly in, the letter of the text are apt to be ignored. (An instance is the very superficial treatment of the Encyclical's teaching on property.) The author is an economist rather than a theologian or philosopher, and in his handling of the more specifically economic implications of the Encyclical he is at his best. In general, his interpretations are sound, almost recklessly safe—and quite unimaginative. Nevertheless, the book should be found very useful by all whose task it is to expound the Encyclical. Had it been compressed to about one-third its present

REVIEWS

size and translated by someone with some sense of idiomatic English it would have served its purpose still better.

Having been compiled by Mr. and Mrs. Cole, published by Mr. Gollancz, and sponsored by the Left Book Club, *The Condition of Britain*, published last April, has been ignored with a quiet conscience by nearly everybody who is not politically "Left." Quite coldly (with few exceptions—one cannot be completely unemotional on such matters) and mainly by the mere presentation of comparative statistics, it tells how the masses of Englishmen, Scots and Welshmen live to-day. It is a devastating book. True, the authors confine themselves almost entirely to the *material* living conditions of our people and have little to say about their souls; but they will tell less materialistically-minded readers how these conditions must tend to destroy souls by the million. The Catholic reader will dissent from the rather restricted outlook which the book sometimes displays, and also from some of the "solutions" which it occasionally proposes; but it is as a documentary record that it is to be recommended to *everybody*. To all who like to imagine that the social and economic conditions of the vast majority of people in this country are anything less than a horror, it is almost a *duty* to read this book. They will need plenty of pluck if they will read it honestly and be prepared to face the consequences.

The People's Front is Mr. Cole's own idea of the corollary to *The Condition of Britain*. In a non-party review such as BLACKFRIARS, little need be said about it except that it is a powerful plea, by a convinced supporter of the Labour Party, for a Popular Front in Britain, and that it not only argues that the formation of such a Front is desirable but also suggests that it is inevitable. If this be so, it will present Catholic workers with a very serious and complicated problem of conscience which should be faced in good time. It will be noted that the People's Front which Mr. Cole advocates and anticipates will be a coalition for the gaining of immediate objectives only, i.e., the removal of present hindrances to the respective objectives of all "non-reactionary" elements and parties, without prejudice to the deep differences of ultimate aims among themselves. It will also be noticed that this People's Front in Britain, if formed in good time, will not be (according to Mr. Cole) predominantly Communist, but on the contrary will incidentally serve to forestall the supplanting of a disintegrating Labour Party by the Communist Party. Mr. Cole makes some important points on "collaboration with Communists" which deserve consideration by pastors of souls and moral theologians who are called upon to decide just what this does and does not imply for Catholics who would be loyal to the Church's directions in the matter.

VICTOR WHITE, O.P.

LITURGY

LITURGICAL EDUCATION. By Dr. Linus Bopp, translated by Albert Paul Schimberg. (Coldwell; 9s. 6d.)

The main thesis of this book is that the Liturgy is the solution to the problem of education, that the basis of true education is to be laid by forming in the child an intelligent liturgical spirit and life.

As a thesis it is magnificent in conception, and no less so is the exposition. Education is not a matter of intellect alone: scholarship is only one factor in the process. The *whole* man must be trained; moral as well as intellectual principles must be assimilated; taste, too, must be developed and cultivated; a right scale of values inculcated; a whole philosophy of life must be formed.

So much is now commonly recognized. But Dr. Bopp has seen that this whole process must be taken on to the supernatural plane, and this by means of the Liturgy. The Liturgy gives dogmatic and moral principles, and this in a vital and living way; it cultivates taste, a right sense of values, a whole supernaturalized outlook on life.

But above all, a supernaturalized education must be a process of supernatural transformation, and this can be the work only of the grace of God. Herein, most especially, lies the supreme educational power of the Liturgy, for, in the author's words: "Since education seeks above all else to renew, to make better, to 'transform,' and this transformation is only possible through the grace of God, and grace is transmitted through the Holy Sacraments, that is through the Liturgy, it is evident that the Liturgy is necessarily the basis of all true education."

The author gives much excellent practical advice as to how this may best be achieved, both in the home and in the school. The training will be at once both *in* and *by* the Liturgy: *in* the Liturgy by instruction; *by* the Liturgy through actual participation in it. He lays timely stress on the fact that such liturgical education will not crush but rather foster individuality; it does not make for a multitude of standardized, mass-produced Catholics. For the Liturgy itself teaches that the Body is made up of a great variety of members, each with a separate and distinctive function. He insists, too, that this supernatural transformation through liturgical education itself fosters the cultivation of natural talents in a unique way.

One other essential point brought out in this book is that of the relation of the Liturgy to social problems. There is no pedantic insistence on the need for Latin or Plainsong, though the value of these are fully recognized: the author will not debar from the fullest participation in the Liturgy those incapable of

REVIEWS

performing with technical accuracy the external expressions of the inner spirit. Because it can be shared by all, the Liturgy is in a sense the whole of life: "the mirror of the Catholic spirit in all departments of life."

Such is the generous view of the Liturgy presented in this book: not a code of regulations—bye-laws of public worship—but the social hierarchic life of a living organism which lives by a divine life; something itself, therefore, vital and divine.

But there is one drawback in recommending this book. The translation gives a general impression of lack of cohesion: it does not "flow," and reads more like a series of notes and jottings than a finished work. The editor's italicized sub-headings, though invaluable for reference, serve to intensify this impression. It says much for the cogency of the author's arguments and the wealth of his thought that he really *does* succeed in conveying his matter in spite of an unfavourable medium.

GERARD MEATH, O.P.

HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY

SAINT AUGUSTINE OF HIPPO. By Fr. Hugh Pope, O.P., S.T.M., D.S.S. (Sands; 12s. 6d.)

It is easier to advertize than to criticize this book. One of its many excellencies, perhaps the chief, is, we think, its arrangement. The work is divided into nine essays in which the author presents St. Augustine to us from several angles whereby we get a better idea of the man, the teacher, and the saint than we could from a long unbroken narrative of his life and events.

The first essay deals with Roman Africa, the North Africa of St. Augustine's day, in its political setting, followed in the second essay by a description of Christian Africa, then one of the most populous and important sections of Christendom, yet utterly destroyed within a century of St. Augustine's death by those Vandals whose siege of Hippo brought such sorrow to the saint dying within its walls. Though the city which was the scene of his labours held out for almost a year after his death, and actually forced the enemy to raise the siege in 431, the defeat of the Romans the following year caused the abandonment of the place to the barbarians who so completely destroyed it that since then it has remained only a name. The present port of Bona lies a little more than a mile from the ancient site.

Though his very episcopal city thus disappeared at his death, yet Augustine remained and still remains a power never waning in Catholic life. Pope after Pope has lavished on his writings the highest praise and Clement XI in the early days of the eighteenth century styled him "the brightest light and the

greatest doctor of the Catholic Church."

In the third essay Fr. Pope gives an account of the actual life of the saint, but the essays that follow all form an integral part of his biography, treating of Augustine as preacher, letter-writer, and defender of the Faith. The author answers the objection made by modern writers to St. Augustine's treatment of the mother of his son Adeodatus. They complain that he did not "at once marry his mistress on his conversion." Father Pope could, I suggest, have made his reply more telling by citing the *Confessions*, which tell us quite plainly that his partner in sin left him, presumably at the prayer of St. Monica, before there was any definite promise of Augustine's conversion. Monica, we are told, sought to reclaim her erring son by arranging for him a marriage with a suitable young woman; and his mistress herself voluntarily surrendered all claim on him for the sake of her own soul, and returned to Africa where she vowed her chastity to God. Augustine, although ashamed of his weakness in contrast to her strength of will, took to himself another mistress as his promised wife was too young for marriage.

In the eighth essay we are given an account of St. Augustine's part in the repression of the Donatists by force. Considering that these heretics not merely threatened the lives of Catholics but actually did murder some and treated many others, including bishops, with the greatest violence, the Catholic Bishops surely would have been guilty men and betrayers of their flock had they not called on the government, a Christian government, for protection and assistance in carrying out the services of the Church and safeguarding Catholics from molestation in attending to the duties of their religion. The marvel is that, guided by St. Augustine, the majority of the bishops (in 405) asked only that those convicted of violence should be punished with severe fines rather than the death penalty. "We felt," he wrote to Count Boniface, the Tribune of Africa, in 417, "that when frightened in this manner and therefore not daring to do as they had been wont, it would be possible to have Catholic truth freely taught and embraced; no one would be compelled to embrace it, but those who wished could do so without fear; for we have no wish to have false and pretended brethren." Earlier in the letter he admitted to the Tribune that the result of the government's repressive laws "was a crowd of genuine converts," and this has been urged as an inconsistency in the Saint's teaching. The reviewer in *The Tablet* says, "it reveals a conflict between his perception that enforced religious conformity is worthless and worse than worthless, and his gratification at certain immediate good results achieved by imperial edicts enforcing conformity upon the

Donatists." Surely, however, there is nothing to be astonished at in the many genuine conversions of those brought to the knowledge of the truth at first unwillingly. But St. Augustine does seem to approve of this government coercion, for he distinctly says, "partly through people obeying God's admonitions, partly owing to others obeying the Imperial commands, all will be called to salvation, all will be recalled from destruction . . . Anyone refusing to obey Imperial laws enacted for God's Truth deserves severe punishment." The letter does at first sight seem to include more than one contradictory view; but the statement made in the latter part of the letter, which I quoted first, refers of course to the Saint's view in 405, which he certainly seems to have modified greatly, if not actually changed when writing to Boniface twelve years later.

Father Pope has indeed achieved a great work and not only the Catholic public will be grateful to him, but many sincere friends of St. Augustine outside the Catholic Church will undoubtedly welcome the volume. The publishers are also to be congratulated on the manner they have produced the book. The four maps at the end are extremely well executed.

WALTER GUMBLEY, O.P.

St. DOMINIC AND HIS SONS. By Teresa Lloyd. For Boys and Girls. (Sands and Co.; 3s. 6d.)

Miss Lloyd has already proved conclusively, in her *St. Francis for Little Folk* and other works, that she has a more than ordinary gift of writing for the young mind. But she has given us nothing better than this bird's-eye view of Friar Preachers throughout the centuries. It was not an easy task that she set herself to do. It is a platitude to say that St. Dominic and his sons have not had the popular and easy appeal of St. Francis and his friars; and this is not merely due to the mythical tradition of the typical Dominican as an ogre of the Inquisition; it is due also to the fact that the devotion of the Order to Divine Truth in all its aspects has been unduly emphasized on its purely intellectual side, so that the Dominican Saints have seemed somewhat unhuman, or at any rate unhumane. Miss Lloyd has done much to restore the true balance. But the remarkable thing is that she has done this not only by the easy way of introducing very human and attractive facts from the lives of St. Dominic and his sons, but also by the difficult way of explaining in simple language the learning and living and teaching of Truth which is of the very essence of Dominican sanctity.

Miss Lloyd has chosen her subjects extraordinarily well. More than a third of the book is occupied with the story of St. Dominic himself, and the sweetness, the gentleness, the

humility, as well as the burning charity and zeal, of the holy Patriarch, are vividly pictured in a series of vignettes, or better in a succession of brush strokes which combine to produce a beautiful and life-like portrait. The brief stories of the other saints and holy sons of St. Dominic, which go to form the rest of the book, are much less detailed but have the same quality of vividness and beauty; Blessed Jordan, St. Albert the Great, St. Thomas Aquinas, St. Antoninus, St. Pius V, all these holy and typical Dominicans are made to live again within the small compass of less than forty pages. Cardinal Howard makes a brief, perhaps too brief, appearance; whilst Father Lacordaire and Father Thomas Burke, two of the greatest preachers of the nineteenth century, are etched with a very sure and informed hand, noticeable especially in the intermingling of holiness and humour so typical of Father Tom. Finally, there is a well-chosen summary of the life and work of Father Bede Jarrett, probably the most representative Dominican of our own day, to bring to a successful conclusion a very valuable contribution to the literature of the Order.

It would ill become us, however, to bring this review to an end without calling attention to the format and general production of the volume. In several of their recent publications Messrs. Sands have shown that they are determined to produce the best material in the best way. This present book is no exception. The printing and paper are admirable, the illustrations are well chosen and beautifully reproduced, and the dust-cover is most attractive, offering in all very good value for the modest price asked.

HILARY J. CARPENTER, O.P.

FATHER BROWN ON CHESTERTON. By Mgr. John O'Connor.
(Burns, Oates; 5s.)

When Gilbert Chesterton first went to the Holy Land he found Jerusalem one morning deep in snow, as it had not been deep within the memory of man. Some of us who loved Gilbert Chesterton for his knightly defence both of little things and of old customs could not help seeing in this freak of tropical skies something more than an unwonted but casual fall of snow. We remembered, and we knew that God also remembered, Gilbert Chesterton's defence of the customary Christmas; not just the turkey and plum pudding Christmas of the dining room, but the snow-covered Bethlehems and the snow-bearded Santa Claus of the nursery Christmas. And we could "see amid the winter snow" that startled even the merchants of Jerusalem and the shepherds of Bethlehem, Christ the Child's welcome to one who always looked upon himself as a child who had wandered wondering amongst the prophets.

NOTICES

For us it was God's remembering and grateful heart that gave this welcome of Christmas when a child from the far north came to Bethlehem.

But it was no less the remembering and grateful heart of God that gave to this child the writer of this book who was to welcome him into the Holy Land of the Church.

No such pilgrim of the birth had found his way into the little flock of English Catholics since Newman made that net of faith which was so quiet and emotionless as to seem not faith but only reason.

As if to authenticate the reality of their faith both these men knelt and confessed their sins to a legate from an old Catholic country. Littlemore has become one of England's pilgrim places because one night the genius of a great religious movement became a child of Alma Mater Ecclesia. But for some of us who have loved Gilbert Chesterton the ascetic monastery of Littlemore is hardly more sacred than the Railway Hotel, Beaconsfield, where on Sunday, July 30, 1922, Father John O'Connor officially announced the birth of a male child in the home of English Catholics.

The priest who welcomed Gilbert Chesterton into the Holy Land of his soul has secrets which must be forever untold. But the things he could tell and has told will make this little book live by the life not only of the hero of whom it tells but also of the teller who knew his hero as no other knew yet kept him always as his hero.

The things we of to-day once saw against their background of time and place are gradually being seen in "the glass of eternity." Even now that sight is allowing the little flock of English Catholics to realize how God was kind to us when He gave us Gilbert Chesterton. And every line in this book of Father Brown tells us how kind God was to Gilbert Chesterton when He gave him as "soul friend" the gifted, human-hearted priest, whose name if fitly quartered with his hero on the title page.

VINCENT McNABB, O.P.

NOTICES

COMPLINE according to the Dominican Rite. In Latin and English. (Blackfriars, Oxford. Cloth, 2s. post free.)

All those who have the privilege of attending Dominican Compline will welcome this handy edition which provides them not only with the ordinary Sunday Compline but also with the variations for week-days, for Feast days, and for the liturgical seasons of the year. They will be happy, too, to find the English translation of the psalms, hymns, etc., as well as of the rubrics governing the variations in their use. Incidentally several interesting translations from ancient sources have been

preserved in this way. After giving a useful ruling as to the employment of the "Sunday" psalms on certain Feast days the *Foreword* concludes: "If, in addition to noting this rule, the pious reader will take care to familiarize himself with the contents of this little book, he will have small difficulty in following the public recitation of Compline, or even in reciting privately this official 'Night Prayers' of Holy Mother Church." We commend this suggestion, together with the handy and well printed volume itself, to the notice of our readers.

H. J. C.

DAS KATHOLISCHE SCHRIFTUM IM HEUTIGEN ENGLAND. By Joseph Metzger. (Kösel u. Pustet, Munich; RM. 5.80.)

This author has clearly a very great capacity for taking pains: he has produced a large volume likely to be extremely useful for reference. He derives modern English Catholic literature mainly from the Oxford Movement, and gives a full account of all important and almost all unimportant Catholic writers in England from that time till the present day. Unfortunately, he seems unable to distinguish between good and bad writing: he seems to suppose that Childe and Evan Morgan are as important as Hopkins, and Coventry Patmore deserving of no more admiration than Lord Alfred Douglas. There is something schoolgirlish in his anxiety to determine definitely who is the "greatest" male or female Catholic poet or novelist; and in this he is as bold as the writer in the current *Dublin Review*, who begins his article with the arresting pronouncement: "Hopkins is the best nineteenth century poet." The book is weak, too, in literary history: Crashaw and Vaughan appear as *mittelälterlich* (mediaeval), and Herr Metzger accepts without question the nonsense Francis Thompson wrote about the former. His literary criticisms lack originality: they are almost invariably conventional and seem very often to be modelled on those of A. C. Ward. He shows little appreciation of the importance of form to a writer, and his classification of authors and influences inclines to be very superficial. But in the matter of painstaking industry Herr Metzger is an example to all Englishmen.

G. S. S.

JANE VERSUS JONATHAN. By Vera Barclay. (Burns, Oates; 3s. 6d.)

SNOWFLAKE IN BIARRITZ. By Peggy Egerton-Bird. (Burns, Oates, 2s. 6d.)

It is interesting to read in rapid succession a book written about children for children by a grown-up and another about grown-ups for grown-ups by a child—that is how I interpret

NOTICES

these two volumes. Miss Barclay is a well-known expert in the former class; Miss Egerton-Bird is a newcomer in the other class; and both are remarkably interesting. Those familiar with Miss Barclay's other books in this admirable series of *Books for Young People* will be delighted to meet Jane again; Jane is very natural and very lovable. Before, it was "Jane will you behave"; but now we have Jane trying to behave and, on the whole, succeeding very well. This particular story is not so obviously informative as the others have been, but it is more formative in a subtle way. Not that it is a "moral tale," for it will be enjoyed by any child for its naturalness and its incident; the moral will probably point itself. In her own way—a very different way—Snowflake is as attractive as Jane. But she is not a very ordinary child. Occasionally one gets the impression that it is a grown-up pretending to be a child, and not quite succeeding. More often the genuine and ingenuous childishness is transparent and wholly delightful. The narrative is packed with interest, for the family visited Lourdes and Loyola and other places likely to produce reactions in a child. Those reactions are all interesting, and sometimes unexpected. The illustrations, by the author, are delicious. It is undoubtedly a book that will be enjoyed by all grown-ups—but perhaps not really appreciated by children.

H. J. C.

PEDANT POEMS. By Neville Watts. (Burns, Oates; 2s. 6d.)
ALCAZAR. By Egerton Clarke. (Burns, Oates; 1s.)

The subject matter of *Pedant Poems* is conventional. Mr. Watts writes about most of the things which the poets at the end of last century and the beginning of this liked to write about, of "golden weather," "sun-kissed sea," and dusk and "the haze where the hills lie dreaming." His treatment is also conventional: he makes full use of imagery and personification, but of a kind which is rarely either new or striking. What really holds his verse together is strong rhythm and firm respect for form. He makes quite clear the handicap suffered by a poet such as Mr. Clarke, who, if indeed he has a good ear and some sense of form, chooses to suppress these qualities. Yet Mr. Clarke has something new to say, at least he has on the occasions when he escapes from the influence of Chesterton. He can walk down the Edgware Road and find between the objects he sees there relationships which he can in his verse work up into new metaphors. But good poetry is born of the marriage of matter and form, and in Mr. Clarke the latter is at fault.

G. S. S.

BLACKFRIARS

BOOKS RECEIVED

BURNS OATES: *The People of God*, Rt. Rev. Anscar Vonier, O.S.B. (5s.); *The Guardian Angel's Hour*, Sophie zu Eltz (3s. 6d.); *An Army Chaplain's War Memories*, Henry Day, S.J. (5s.); *Father Brown on Chesterton*, Mgr. John O'Connor (5s.); *The Muddle-headed Postman, and Other Stories*, Carry Hogg (3s. 6d.); *Mr. Fuzzy and His Friends*, Agnes Blundell (3s. 6d.); *Letters of St. Vincent de Paul*, tr. and ed. Rev. Joseph Leonard (21s.); *Know your Faith, A Refresher Course in the Catechism*, E. C. Messenger (2s. 6d.); *Apologetics for the Pulpit*, Aloysius Roche, Vol. III (6s.); *Franciscan Fables*, Stanley B. James (3s. 6d.); *The Four Gospels* (Rheims version) (1s. 6d.); *God's Good Cheer*, Vincent McNabb, O.P. (3s. 6d.); *Utopia*, St. Thomas More, tr. Ralph Robinson, ed. Mgr. P. E. Hallett (6s.); *Two Masters* (poems), Barbara Rochford (2s. 6d.).

CENTENARY PRESS (G. Bles): *Catholicism and the Need for Revolution*, F. H. Amphlett Micklewright (5s.).

COLDWELL: *The Dissident Eastern Churches*, Donald Attwater (15s.).

DENT: *Von Hügel and Tyrrell, The Story of a Friendship*, M. D. Petre (7s. 6d.).

EDITIONS ORIENTATIONS (La Sarte, Huy, Belgium): *La reforme de l'Etat: Rapports des journées d'études sociales* (15 B.fr.).

GOLLANZ: *The Condition of Britain*, C. D. H. and M. I. Cole (7s. 6d.); *The People's Front*, G. D. H. Cole (7s. 6d.).

HEATH CRANTON: *On a Troopship to India*, Henry C. Day, S.J., M.C. (3s. 6d.).

HERDER (Friburg i. B.): *Die Kirchenväter und das Evangelium, Erläuterungen der hl. Väter zu den Sonn- und Festagsevangelien . . . aus der "Catena Aurea" des hl. Thomas von Aquin*, ed. Josef Hosse (RM. 4.60 and 5.80); *Ecclesia Orans: Die Väterlesungen des Breviers* (5. Abt.) (RM. 4.40 and 5.60).

HERDER (London): *Disciplinary Decrees of the General Councils*, H. J. Schroeder, O.P. (25s.).

HODDER & STOUGHTON: *The War Against God*, Sidney Dark and R. S. Essex (5s.).

LITURGICAL PRESS (Collegeville, Minn.): *Manual for the Oblates of St. Benedict*, Rt. Rev. Alcuin Deutsch, O.S.B. (\$1.00.)

LONGMANS: *Science and Common Sense*, W. R. Thompson, F.R.S., Preface by J. Maritain (7s. 6d.); *The Power and Secret of the Papacy* Rene Fülöp-Miller (7s. 6d.).

MACMILLAN: *Civitas Dei*, Lionel Curtis, Vol. III. (5s.)

MARIETTI (Turin): *Praxis Ordinandorum*, Cesare Carbone (ed. 3a) L. 10.—; *Praelectiones Bibliae ad usum scholarum*, V.T. Liber alter, Hadrian Simon, C.S.S.R. (L. 20.—); *De Sacris Functionibus*, A. Moretti, Vol. II. (L. 30.—); *Missae Defunctorum ex Missali Romano desumptae . . . accedit Ritus Absolutionis pro Defunctis* (n.p.).

RICH & COWAN: *Can I be happy?* Desmond Morse-Boycott (3s. 6d.).

SHEED & WARD: *Wedlock*, C. C. Martindale, S.J. (2s. 6d.); *Hymns to the Church*, Gertrud von le Fort (3s. 6d.).

RECENT
CONTRIBUTORS
in
GK's WEEKLY

H. BELLOC

DOUGLAS NEWTON

PROF. J. W. SCOTT

JANE SOAMES

VIOLA TREE

SPECIAL FEATURES:

“Broadcasts from Abroad” (Ariel)

Drama (J. K. Prothero and H.D.C.P.)

B.O.W

New and Forthcoming Publications

PLAIN TALKS ON THE CATHOLIC RELIGION

Rev H. A. JOHNSTON, S.J. Crown 8vo. 5s.

An excellent series of talks broadcast with great success from Melbourne by the Rector of Corpus Christi Seminary at Worrivee.

"These clear logical satisfying expositions of Catholic teaching will prove of great value to those who, under God's inspiration, are seeking the light as well as to those priests and others who are engaged in the instruction of converts."—*Archbishop Mannix*.

UTOPIA

St. THOMAS MORE Crown 8vo. 6s.

LORD RUSSELL OF KILLOWEN supplies a full foreword on More's social theories to this new edition of the UTOPIA, which has been prepared by Mgr. Hallett, who gives many notes concerning the religious and other references which occur in the text. UTOPIA, so often quoted in modern times, is here given in modern English.

THE PEOPLE OF GOD

Abbot VONIER, O.S.B. Crown 8vo. 5s.

A call to form a united front against the prevalent attacks on Christianity, so that there may be deep spiritual solidarity among the people of God in time of tribulation and assault.

GOD'S GOOD CHEER

Rev. VINCENT McNABB, O.P. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.

Meditations centred round the Holy Eucharist under a title explained in the Preface: "Then the only begotten Son, as Messenger from God, came with the Good-news of an invitation, not only to the royal Presence, but to the royal Table. God's Good-news, as carried by the Son, was an invitation to come and share God's Good-cheer."

BURNS OATES & WASHBOURNE

Birmingham, Liverpool, Manchester, Glasgow,
Dublin

- Publishers to the Holy See
- Booksellers
- Church Furnishers

43-45 Newgate St., E.C.1 : 129 Victoria St., S.W.1

LONDON